

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1857.

ART. I.—CHRISTIANITY IN AMERICA.

A report prepared by request for the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance held at Berlin in September, 1857.

Since the introduction of Christianity which constitutes the divine-human centre and turning point of history, no facts occurred which exceed in importance the invention of the printing press, the discovery of America, and the reformation of the Church. The one is the boldest conquest of the Romanic, the other two are the greatest deeds of the Germanic mind, for the benefit of the entire family of Christian nations. They bring to a close and sum up the last meaning of the Middle Age, while they break the way, at the same time, and control the course, of modern history. Though independent of each other and separated by one or two generations, they were yet intimately connected, especially in their prospective bearings. The press is the main lever of modern civilization; Protestantism is the chief bearer of modern Christianity; America is the largest theatre for both. There is no country under the sun, England hardly excepted, in which the press, at least the periodical press, is so free and independent, so ramified and powerful over public opinion, and where Protestantism is so fully and consistently developed, not only in the religious, but also in the whole political and social life of

the nation, as in the United States of North America. Here we see already, as in a second Europe, all the good and bad elements of the old world, in chaotic fermentation, but placed under new conditions and relations, invigorated by their very amalgamation, and preparing for a new era in the ever progressing history of the human race.

Without detracting from the just merit and importance of any nation, we may boldly assert that the deepest intellectual work of Protestantism and the solution of its theological problems have been mainly, though not exclusively, committed, by an all ruling Providence, to the Germans, while the social and political organization of Protestantism, the solution of its moral problems and the spread of modern civilization in all colonial countries and new territories to the ends of the globe, is the peculiar mission of the English and Americans. In view of such great objects, the two main branches of the same Teutonic stock may well extend to each other, across the Channel and the Atlantic, the hand of brotherhood, and celebrate a free Christian love-feast in the metropolis of German science at the invitation of a monarch who protects them both on the strongest Protestant throne of the Continent, and who honestly wishes the unity of the Evangelical Church and the victory of the heavenly King over all the princes and nations of the earth.

The significance of the discovery of America was felt to some extent even by the celebrated Genoese who reared by this deed an imperishable monument to his name. "Let processions be made; let festivals be celebrated; let temples be adorned with branches and flowers. For Christ rejoices on earth as in heaven, in view of the future redemption of souls. Let us rejoice, also, for the temporal benefit which will result from the discovery, not merely to Spain, but to all Christendom." Thus wrote the bold navigator to the treasurer of Spain, on the return from his first voyage to the new world, when he had attained the object of his noble ambition, and established, beyond a doubt, his theory, after eighteen years of suspense and sol-

licitation, in the face of prejudice and superstition, skepticism and sophistry, sneer and ridicule. He was now to enjoy the honeyed draught of popular and royal favor, to be followed, alas, so soon by the bitter cup of envy, calumny and insult. His journey from the port of Palos to Seville and Barcelona resembled the triumphal march of a conqueror, the eager multitudes thronging the streets, the windows, the balconies and house-tops and rending the air with shouts of acclamation. The nobility and cavaliers, together with the authorities of Barcelona, escorted him from the gates of the city to the royal presence. Ferdinand and Isabella, seated under a superb canopy of state and surrounded by all the splendor of the proudest days of the Spanish monarchy, received the distinguished stranger who, a short time before, had been derided at this very court as an enthusiast and a madman, with the most gracious condescension, and listened with tears of joy to his glowing description of the Western islands, illustrated by several living representatives of the simple-hearted natives, and specimens of unknown birds, aromatic plants, and shining gold which he had brought with him as harbingers of greater discoveries yet to be made. When the admiral had finished, the King and Queen, together with the flower of the nobility and the dignitaries of the Church, sank upon their knees, and raising their clasped hands to heaven, they joined in the solemn *Te Deum* of the royal chapel in pious celebration of so glorious a conquest to the crown of Spain and the Kingdom of Christ. Nor was this joy confined to Spain. The whole age, as far as it expressed itself in a few leading intellects, shared in the delight at the startling news. At the court of Henry VII of England, the great event was pronounced "a thing more divine than human." Peter Martyr gave expression to the feelings of scholars, when he wrote to Pomponio Laeto: "You tell me that you leaped for joy, and that your delight mingled with tears, when you read my epistle that assured you of the hitherto hidden world of the antipodes." The whole of civilized Europe was filled with wonder at the discovery of

another world which burst upon it with such sudden splendor, and anticipated from it untold additions to the wealth, knowledge and happiness of mankind.

And yet Columbus and his age could have but a very imperfect idea of the immense bearing of this event. He died in the conviction that he had touched simply on the borders of Asia, that Hispaniola was the ancient Ophir visited by the ships of Solomon, and that Cuba was connected with Spain by *terra firma*. He could not dream of that still greater discovery of a new world of thought which followed on the very heels of his material discovery; nor could he foresee the future dominion of the Anglo Saxon race which, in consequence of the reformation and in spite of the bulls of Alexander VI, that divided the Western hemisphere between the crowns of Spain and Portugal, became master of the destinies of America.

We would not detract in the least from the merits of Catholicism and of the Romanic nations in Christianizing and civilizing the barbarians of the Middle Ages. But no unprejudiced observer can deny for a moment, that the whole intellectual and moral weight of America is conditioned by the English nationality and the Protestant religion. The most superficial comparison of the Northern, i. e. the predominantly Anglo-Protestant half of this continent, with the Southern or Romano-Catholic half, teaches the immense superiority of the former in every branch of political, social, moral and religious life. The contrast here presented of national prosperity and misery, progress and stagnation, life and death, is even more striking than that which is admitted to exist between the Northern or Anglo-Protestant and the Southern or Celtic Catholic part of Ireland, between the Reformed and the Roman Catholic cantons of Switzerland, between Portugal and Holland, Italy and Prussia, Spain and England. Even from Mexico, which is so highly favored by nature, we hear nothing, alas, but priest craft and military despotism, ignorance and superstition, revolution and anarchy in unbroken succession. The South American sham-republics prove to a demon-

stration, that the mere forms of a republic without the moral basis of self-government, can as little secure the prosperity of a nation as the forms of monarchy, and that political freedom without religious freedom (which is altogether unknown there) amounts to an empty delusion and falsehood.

North America came under the control and fostering care of the English nationality, from the very beginning of its history, when Cabot touched on the shores of Labrador and Newfoundland, A. D., 1497, one year before Columbus set foot on the mainland of South America. But its most important part has outgrown the era of colonial dependence and is evidently the chief representative of the new world; hence its citizens are emphatically called Americans.

The unexampled external and internal development of the United States of North America is the wonder of modern history. Hardly more than eighty years have elapsed since, by the declaration of independence, they took a place among the nations of the earth; and their present chief magistrate was born several years before the death of the venerable patriarch and first President of the Republic in the retired village where I write these lines, and where his father, a plain but honest citizen, originally from the North of Ireland, lies buried. In this short period the confederation has grown from thirteen States, with hardly three millions of inhabitants, to thirty-one States (there will soon be thirty-four) and nine Territories with more than twenty-seven millions. It extends now over an inexhaustibly rich country of about three millions of English square miles, and rules unconquered and unconquerable from the lakes of Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, from the coasts of the Atlantic to the shores of the Pacific, thus stretching one arm of its commerce and influence towards Europe and Africa, the other towards Asia and Australia. This extension of territory and population is not the result of bloody wars of conquest, but of the peaceful purchase of Louisiana (1803), Florida (1820), Oregon and Texas (1845), California, Utah and New Mexico (1848), and of a peaceful migration of nations from nearly all parts of Europe, espe-

cially from England, Ireland and Germany, an emigration which, in 1854 alone, amounted to nearly half a million of souls, and which, though it has since considerably declined, will go on more or less without interruption, until the boundless prairies and forests to the base of the Rocky Mountains and the golden shores of California shall be inhabited by civilized men and made available for those purposes for which Providence created them. Equally astounding is the internal growth of the Republic in all departments of industry, art and education, and betrays an energy and spirit of enterprize which knows no difficulty from the mowing and reaping machine to the colossal undertaking of the transatlantic telegraph, and makes America already a successful rival of England. This inward progress is to be attributed, next to the favors of Providence and nature, to the rich inheritance of European civilization with which the States entered upon their career, instead of having to begin with barbarism and heathenism; to the spirit of freedom which animates their civil and religious institutions; and finally to the contact of different nationalities on an Anglo-Saxon basis, which convey new nourishment from year to year to be converted into national American flesh and blood by the digestive power of this fresh and vigorous people. And yet this nation is evidently still in its early youth, full of youthful hopes and dreams, courage and presumption, virtues and follies, and has, according to human calculation, a long and brilliant career before it, unless—which may God prevent—internal distraction and decay should lay the giant youth in an untimely and inglorious grave.

But here arises the question full of interest to every educated and Christian man: Has the moral and religious development of the United States kept pace with their gigantic material and political progress? Is the present condition of Christianity and the Church as flourishing and promising in this Western land, as the state of its commerce, agriculture, and secular arts? May we look forward to as brilliant a period of Church history in this

land of freedom and promise, and to the final victory of the peaceful reign of Christ which will outlast all the kingdoms of this world?

As I thus enter upon my proper task, I ask you not to expect from me on this occasion a variety of geographical and statistical notices which, in so young and rapidly changing a country as America, would become obsolete in a few months; nor a detailed account of the different denominations of the land, which would require several volumes instead of a few sheets, since it would have to embrace all churches and sects of Christendom from Romanism down to Irvingism and Mormonism.

I shall attempt nothing more than a condensed, though tolerably complete and clear, exposition of the *characteristic features of American Christianity as distinct from the European.*

Before we specify the separate traits which constitute the general religious character and condition of the American nation, we must remember that England is the bridge from the Continent of Europe to that of America, and hence furnishes the key for a genetic knowledge of the latter. The United States is, not only as regards language, manners, customs, laws and literature, but also as regards religion and the Church, the daughter of that remarkable island from which the Puritan pilgrim fathers of Massachusetts, the Episcopalian cavaliers of Virginia, the Quakers and Presbyterians of Pennsylvania emigrated two hundred years ago to lay, in the fear of God, the foundation of a new nation. But they go, in principle, an important step beyond the mother country in religion as well as in politics. I say in principle, which is quite compatible with the acknowledgment of the present superiority of the older English over the younger Americans, in all that makes up the actual condition of a matured and well organized national life. The American republic aims at a far more complete realization of the idea of religious and civil liberty and equality on the basis of self-government and popular education, or of that general priesthood and kingship, which seems to be the ultimate end of the history of Church

and State, though it can never be fully attained till the second coming of Christ as the glorious King of nations and of saints. To this must be added as modifying influences, partly stimulating, partly restraining, the different national elements from the Continent of Europe, especially the Dutch and French in New York and New Jersey, and the German in all the middle and western States. America is as yet in every respect less mature, compact and solid, but more elastic, expansive and more capable of universal development than England. It rules not merely over an island, but over a continent and two oceans.

1. Church and State.

If we take into consideration first the legal and social basis on which all the denominations and sects of the United States stand, we are confronted at once with what constitutes the most characteristic feature of American Christianity, namely, the *complete separation of Church and State* and the *absolute freedom of religion*. Here the United States have indeed opened a new chapter in church history, which differs widely from the ante-nicene heathen persecution of the Church by the State, from the mediaeval Roman Catholic dominion of the Church over the State, and from the modern European Protestant subjection of the Church to the State. Here they have made the first bold attempt to carry out to its last consequences the Protestant principle of religious subjectivity and toleration and to make it the basis and guarantee of civil and political freedom. Here they have already exerted a powerful influence upon public opinion in Europe, as the steady progress of similar principles in England, (not only) but also on the Continent (think for instance of the Prussian decree of toleration of 1847 and the 12th article of the new Prussian constitution of 1850), the rise and progress of the Free Church of Scotland, the Free Church of the Canton de Vaud, and a considerable number of works of such men as Vinet and others sufficiently testify. The more important it is, that this point should be placed in its proper light and carefully guarded against frequent misrepresentations of European

writers, who can see nothing but culpable indifferentism and hostility to Christianity in any attempt to emancipate the State from the Church and the Church from the State.

It is true, already Constantine the Great gave to his subjects full liberty of religion in his famous edict of toleration of 313; but this was simply a temporary measure of political expediency and a natural transition from the persecution of Christianity to its exclusive dominion in the old Roman empire. It is true, the Reformers of the sixteenth century claimed and exercised the liberty of protest against the Papal uniformity and tyranny of conscience; but they inconsistently denied the same right to others as soon as the new faith was fairly established by law. It is true, a Voltaire of France, a Frederic the Great of Prussia, and a Jefferson of America, brought forth and defended, in the last century, the principle that morality is independent of religion, that religion belongs exclusively to man's private conviction, and that every body should be permitted—to use Frederic's favorite expression—"to save his soul according to his own fashion;" but these distinguished men were more concerned about the liberty of irreligion than the liberty of religion, and that a toleration resting on indifferentism and infidelity may under circumstances pass over into the fiercest intolerance to religion itself, is amply shown by the horrible scenes of the French revolution and the absurd blasphemy enacted under Robespierre of de-throning the Almighty in favor of fallen reason turned mad. With such wicked follies America has nothing to do whatever.

Its liberties, both civil and religious, are of English growth, and resulted from those severe and earnest struggles commencing with the reformation and continued through the greater part of the seventeenth century, in which the Protestant principle, under its most rigorous Puritanic form, was arrayed against the Catholic traditions of the past, and the principle of individual freedom against the principle of general uniformity, until in 1688, they came to a compromise in an established Church, representing the

majority simply of the nation, and tolerating, with certain restrictions, the dissenting minority, still excluding, however, the Roman Catholics, and the anti-Trinitarians from the offices of government. As matters now stand since the abolition of the test act and the passage of the reform bill in 1829, the English dissenters, both Catholic, Protestant and Unitarian, enjoy practically the same amount of freedom as the various sects in the United States, and according to the census report of 1854, they now even outnumber in their combined force the membership of the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland. But England still maintains in theory and in fact the principle of a religion established by civil law, i. e., the Episcopalian in England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian in Scotland, and regards the toleration granted to all who dissent from it as concessions simply which may be withdrawn again by the same government who gave it (think of the antipapal ecclesiastical titles' bill of 1851). But the Federal Constitution of the United States, formed by the combined wisdom and experience of the revolutionary fathers and patriots under the presiding counsel of Washington, disowns all idea of an ecclesiastical establishment and proclaims the liberty of religion as a sacred right of nature and a permanent principle, by the famous declaration: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."*

* The original Constitution as made by the Convention of Philadelphia in 1787, says nothing of religion except in the third clause to Article VI, which excludes all religious tests as a qualification to any office or trust under the United States. But this is simply negative and secures the independence of the State, but not of the Church. The law as given above is the first article of the Amendments which were proposed in the first Congress, Sept 25th, 1789, having been approved of by three fourths of the thirteen States, were ratified by Congress in December 15, 1791, and thus became part of the Constitution. The article on religion was first proposed, it seems, by Charles Pinckney, of South Carolina, in this form: "The Legislature of the United States shall pass no law on the subject of religion, nor touching or abridging the liberty of the press; nor shall the privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus ever be suspended, except in case of rebellion or invasion." See Elliot's Debates on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, Vol. V. p. 131.

The connection of religious liberty with the liberty of speech and of the press, and with the right of public assemblage and petition, points out the true interpretation of this article. Religious liberty in the sense of the Federal Constitution, which may be called the political Bible of the Americans, is not only negative, but above all positive, not freedom from religion, but freedom of religion and its actual exercise; just as the freedom of the press is not the negation or absence of the press, but its real existence and active operation. In a sinful world like ours the full freedom of religion does imply indeed the freedom of irreligion, nor can we expect the right use of liberty of any kind to exist without the possibility of its abuse by bad men. But the question is, Whether the abuse of religious liberty so far as it is strictly confined to the sphere of religion and does not violate the civil and political order, belongs to the jurisdiction of the State, or not? The American Constitution answers this question in the negative, and does so, we wish it to be distinctly understood, not from indifference or contempt of religion, but on the contrary from high regard for the same, as a sacred affair of man with God that lies far beyond all physical force and political legislation, and has no value before God and men, unless it be the free expression of the inmost conviction. It was felt that it would be best for the interests of religion as well as for the secular government, to keep them altogether distinct; that this separation was the legitimate result of the freedom of conscience; that the confounding of the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of this world would lead to endless difficulties; that this peaceful separation would be the distinctive feature of America and the safeguard against both ecclesiastical and political despotism. The American government then has tied its own hands from the very start, as regards religion and the Church, by declaring them equally independent of its legislation and jurisdiction, as it claims to be independent in turn of any particular profession or creed, whatever may be the religion of its members in their private capacity.

From the European point of view this may appear as a dissolution of the sacred and time-honored alliance of the government with Christianity, as a degradation and contraction of the idea of the State by sundering it from all higher moral duties and conforming it simply to the secular and material interests of the nation. But it should be remembered, that it was a voluntary self-limitation, and that in favor of personal and ecclesiastical rights and liberties. What the State lost, or rather what it never possessed in North America (except in a few colonies before the revolution), accrues to the benefit of the individual, of free associations, and of the Church itself.

This, it seems to me, is the true sense of that article from which must be dated a new epoch in the history of the relation of Church and State. It is not a sanction of irreligion and the infidel philosophy of Voltaire, but a solemn protection and guarantee of religion against undue encroachments of the civil power both legislative and administrative. If time permitted, I might prove this at length, I think, from all the official documents bearing upon the subject, such as the "Madison Papers," the Congressional Debates and Proceedings of 1789 (Gale's edition Vol. I, p. 729, ff), the Debates of the several State Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution (Elliot's edition in 5 vols. 1845), and the private writings and the personal religious character of its principal framers, especially Washington, Madison, Hamilton and Jay.

I know well enough that Jefferson who took such a leading and efficient part in the separation of government from religion in Virginia as early as 1779, nearly ten years before the formation of the Federal Constitution, was a deist of the French school, and that he meant religious liberty, as he says expressly in his Autobiography, to be absolutely universal and to "comprehend, within the mantle of its protection, the Jew and the Gentile, the Christian and the Mahometan, the Hindoo and infidel of every denomination." But he had nothing to do with the framing of the Federal Constitution, being then absent in France, nor could he

ever have succeeded in the overthrow of the Episcopal establishment in Virginia, had he not been strongly supported by the unpopularity of the Church of England arising from its connection with the English government, and by the united influence of all the dissenters in Virginia, especially the Presbyterians, Baptists and Quakers, who had no sympathy, of course, with his infidel sentiments.

The framers of the Constitution of 1787 were all Christians, at least in name, and the religious sects which then existed in the land, were all Christian sects, with the exception, perhaps, of a few Jewish synagogues. The liberty, therefore, which they secured to religion, presupposed Christianity as the general basis, and it never entered their minds that heathenism, or Mohammedanism, or Judaism, or any other religion would ever take the place of the Christian, or assume any importance in the country sufficient to justify a restriction of that liberty. Nor were they mistaken in this expectation. Christianity is now far stronger and more deeply rooted in the American people than it was in that skeptical age, and yet there is not a single denomination which would advocate a repeal of the first amendment to the Constitution. Congress moreover appoints chaplains to this day and opens its sessions with prayer—differing widely in this respect from the unfortunate German Parliament of 1848, which voted down a proposition to that effect with sneering contempt, and the President of the United States fills the chaplaincies in the army and navy (mostly with Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist clergymen). All this, as well as the customary appointment of days of public prayer and thanksgiving by the Governors of the several States, may be unconstitutional, as Jefferson maintained; it certainly is not prescribed (though still less prohibited) by the Constitution; yet it is a voluntary, and for this very reason the more sincere and valuable tribute to Christianity, as adhering not, indeed, to the State as such, but to the nation, and consequently also to its representatives in the highest spheres of legislation and administration. I venture to say, that,

with all the absence of constitutional disqualification, it would be far more difficult in the United States than either in Germany, or France, or Russia, to elect an open enemy of Christianity to a high office of State, and if he should be elected, it would not be on account, but in spite of his infidelity, and from purely political considerations.

Whatever may be the abstract merits of the question here under consideration, it must be admitted that religious liberty, and what necessarily preceeds it, religious toleration, is not an artificial growth in the United States, nor the violation of any established historical rights, but natural and unavoidable. Whatever may best suit other countries, it is the only possible state of things here, and no other could be established without a radical revolution and the grossest injustice. This land was from its first settlement a hospitable asylum for persecuted Protestant Christians of every denomination, Puritans, Huguenots, Quakers, Irish Presbyterians, Moravians, Salzburg Lutherans, Reformed Palatinates, also English Catholics (in Maryland), who, under the pressure of persecution had learned to appreciate religious liberty, and exchanged their home for the then unbroken wilderness of a new world, in order that they might enjoy this highest, most important, and most sacred of liberties. It is true, in several of the colonies, which were quite independent of each other before the revolution, the government was identified with a particular denomination, in Virginia and other southern States with Episcopacy, in Massachusetts and the greater part of New England with Congregationalism. It is only too true, moreover, that the Puritans in the seventeenth century inconsistently enough persecuted Baptists, Quakers and Papists almost with the same, though short lived intolerance, which had driven their own fathers across the ocean. But in other colonies, such as Rhode Island, Maryland, and especially Pennsylvania, in whose first settlement not only Quakers, but Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, German Reformed, Moravians, etc., took part, the principle of toleration obtained from the beginning.

When the time had arrived for the colonies to become

an independent confederacy of States, there were so many religious denominations in the land, that the governmental patronage extended to one, would have been injustice to the other, while the toleration of one implied of necessity the toleration of all. Hence the Convention of those patriots, who framed the federal constitution at Philadelphia in 1787, were sacredly bound by every consideration of justice and regard to the rights of the various States and religious parties represented by them, to proclaim perfect liberty of religion and its public exercise. This again could not be done without a complete separation of Church and State, since the degree of the union of the two powers always implies consistently a corresponding amount of exclusiveness and intolerance against all dissenters. There was, therefore, no other just course left for them to pursue, but to deny Congress, from the very start and forever, the right of interfering either negatively or positively with matters of conscience and public worship, and to leave them with the various churches and sects of the land.* The coëxistence of these denominations, nearly all of which sprung directly or indirectly from the great protestant movement of the sixteenth century, and which were forced in part, by persecution, to seek a common asylum in this western world, is the historical condition without which the bond of union between Church and State would probably never have been broken, but continue to exist in the United States, as it does in fact in all the central and south

* From this empirical and common sense point of view the matter was regarded by James Madison, one of the chief framers of the constitution and afterwards President of the United States. In the debate of the Convention of Virginia on the adoption or rejection of the federal constitution, he disposed of the objection that Congress might assume powers over religion, in these words: "Happily for the States, they enjoy the utmost freedom of religion. This freedom arises from that multiplicity of sects which pervades America and which is the best and only security for religious liberty in any society; for where there is such a variety of sects, there cannot be a majority of any one sect to oppress and persecute the rest. Fortunately for this commonwealth (Virginia) a majority of the people are decidedly against any exclusive establishments. I believe it to be so in the other States. There is not a shadow of right in the general government to interfere with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation. Comp. Elliot's Debates, Vol. III, 330.

American republics. The North American toleration and freedom of religion may, therefore, be called the sweet fruit of the bitter European, especially English intolerance and persecution.

As matters now stand, no denomination in the land wishes a change in the relation of Church and State, not even the Roman Catholic. They feel that the liberty of their neighbors is the best and only just security of their own. But whether the same degree of religious liberty be desirable and applicable to Europe, especially to those countries where the majority of the population belong to but one or two confessions, is a very different question, with which we have nothing to do here, being confined simply to the task of giving an objective exhibition of the state of things in America. One remark only I think it proper to make, in order to avoid hasty inferences, that I regard it one of the most difficult problems of Church government and statesmanship to define the exact limits of religious toleration, i. e., not simply the liberty of conscience, which no despot can deny, but the liberty of public worship with the right of proselyting, in those countries which still hold to the principle of some official connection of the government with the Christian religion and a national Church establishment. This problem, I believe, can not be solved abstractly by theory, but only practically and gradually by the irresistible course of events, as was the case in England and in this country. There are questions which are too knotty for philosophy and theology, and can only be satisfactorily answered by history itself.

With the exposition, however, of the relation which the general government of the United States sustains to religion, we have not yet fully disposed of this point. The federal constitution does not prohibit the union of Church and State in the single States. Such a union may exist even in the territories, at least since the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill of 1854, which makes them entirely independent in all internal affairs. In Massachusetts the Puritan establishment continued for many years after the

adoption of the constitution and was only gradually abolished as the exclusive dominion of Puritanism was destroyed partly by an internal apostacy to Unitarianism, partly by the immigration and increase of other sects. Even to this day there exist in most of the States severe laws against blasphemy, the profanation of the Lord's day, attacks on the Christian religion; and in the public schools the Bible must be read or may be read. In one or both of the Carolinas, if I am not mistaken, Universalists are even excluded from appearing as witnesses, because of their denial of the doctrine of future punishment. But with this last exception perhaps, all these regulations are concessions simply which the States make to Christianity, and restrictions they put upon the abuse of religious freedom; but not violations of this liberty itself, as little as laws against theft, murder and adultery can be said to be violations of civil liberty. All State constitutions place the different Christian denominations on a basis of perfect equality before the law, require no religious tests from civil officers beyond the ordinary oath, and levy no taxes for the support of religion. There can be no doubt that the genius of American liberty, if consistently carried out, must lead in every member of the confederacy to an entire separation of the spiritual and secular power as being the most advantageous condition for both.

The only exception to this rule at the present time is the Mormon State or rather territory of Utah; for it has not yet applied and probably never will apply, with its present population, most of which refuse even to be naturalized, for admission into the Union as a member of the confederacy. In the "theo-democratic" government of the Mormons, as they call it, religion and politics are inseparably interwoven, and the civil head (at present Brigham Young, Joe Smith's successor, who was unwisely appointed Governor of Utah under Mr. Fillmore's administration) is also the spiritual head, or high priest of the whole tribe.

But this Mormonism is a monstrous anomaly in America, at war not only with its religion, but equally so with its whole policy and civilization. It recruits itself mostly from

the offscouring of foreign countries, especially England and Wales ; it hates all Christians as heathens ; it stands in open rebellion to the United States government, and will sooner or later have to yield to the armed power of the latter, if not to a war of extermination, unless, what is not improbable, it should destroy itself by internal distractions and moral corruption, or leave once more the territory of the States, before the matter comes to a bloody crisis. The settlement of the Mormon trouble is one of the most important and interesting questions now before the administration at Washington, and may lead to a practical official definition of the true American idea of a republic and the precise limits of religious liberty. At all events the irreconcilable antagonism of the American nationality with the pseudo-Christian, polygamistic, deceitful, rapacious, and rebellious Mormonism is one of the many proofs for the assertion which we made above, that American liberty of religion is not hostility or indifference to religion, and that the separation of Church and State is by no means meant to be a separation of the nation from Christianity, but simply a peaceful emancipation of two distinct, though equally necessary divine institutions for the purpose of enabling them to fulfil the more successfully their peculiar mission.

We have now gained the stand-point, from which alone we can properly understand and appreciate the condition of Christianity and the movements of the Church in the United States of America.

2. *Christianity and the World.*

In consequence of this separation of Church and State we have in America a marked distinction of believing and professing Christians from the unbelieving world which disappears almost entirely on the continent of Europe where every citizen is *eo ipso* also a baptized and confirmed Christian and fully entitled to all the privileges of church-membership at least in the eyes of the law. Another distinction is made, especially in New England, between the Church proper, i. e., the communicating members, and the congregation or society, which includes all who attend preaching

and contribute towards the support of the pastor. The former may be compared to the "fideles," the latter to the "catechumens" of the ante-nicene period. The separation is carried out most fully among the Puritanic denominations, but very imperfectly among Roman Catholics and congregations of continental immigrants.

The separation of Church and State does away, of course, with all compulsory baptism and confirmation. Hence the public profession of Christianity and connection with a particular Church is left altogether to the free choice of every individual. Now this profession is by no means a disgrace or in any way a disadvantage as it was in the days of martyrdom. On the contrary, it belongs to social respectability in America far more than, for instance, in France, where not long since the very reverse was the case, and even in Germany, or any where else on the Continent, to attend at least the preaching of the gospel, and to contribute something towards the support of the ministry. Then we must make allowance for all the educational influences of the family which determine the will of every child more or less, for the high position and influence of woman, who can not live without religion, and for the zeal and rivalry of the many denominations, so that probably very few native American families may be found who are in no connection whatever even as occasional attendants with any Church or sect.

Nevertheless there are many thousands, yea millions in the United States who have never received Christian baptism—not only descendants of the numerous Baptists, but also of indifferent pædobaptist parents—who never make a public profession of religion by confirmation or otherwise, and who leave this mortal life without having ever received the holy communion. The number of church-members, even if we include all the sects, hardly amounts to five millions, or about one fifth of the whole population, and even from these five millions must be deducted thousands who profess religion from impure mercenary motives, and are perhaps much worse at heart than many men of the world.

This is a gloomy fact indeed, and must startle, at first sight, every European who is accustomed to regard his whole land and nation as Christian. But I respectfully ask you—not in a polemical, but historical interest—: Is the proportion of true disciples and followers of Christ to the great mass of purely nominal Christians more favorable in any State-Church of Europe, not excepting even the Church of England, the Kirk of Scotland, the Prussian Wupperthal and the Kingdom of Württemberg, highly favored as they are with all the means of grace? Or has the proportion ever been more favorable in any previous period of church history, except in the first three centuries, when a hypocritical profession was indeed by no means very rare, but far less common than afterwards on account of the persecutions? I ask moreover: Which is the greater anomaly and a more monstrous contradiction, millions of unbaptized and unconfirmed Christians, or millions of baptized and confirmed heathens? The fact that there are cities in Christian Europe where of a hundred thousand inhabitants hardly more than five or six thousand ever attend church, at least as a habit, exceeds every thing which the chronique scandaleuse of America can produce. If the celebration of the Lord's day, the frequentation of divine service and the liberality for religious purposes are reliable criteria of true Christianity, the Americans, as far as my observation goes, must be called the most Christian nation on earth.

The whole difference, then, in this respect, resolves itself into this. In America the unbelievers and indifferentists are mostly out of the church proper, and confine themselves to making money, to politics and other secular pursuits; while in Europe they are all in the church as to the body, and not seldom even preach from the pulpits, rule in the consistories, and teach from the chairs of theology. It is the difference of the snake out of the grass, and the snake in the grass, the devil in the world, and the devil in the house of God. We may regard it as the great advantage of the State-Church system, that it secures to the Church the whole population for baptism, instruction, confirmation,

marriage and spiritual care, and thus gives her an opportunity of doing her whole duty to the whole people. On the other hand, however, every enlightened Christian of Europe must admit, that all compulsion in matters of conscience which is the peculiar province of God, does more harm than good and tends almost of necessity to promote hypocrisy and secret opposition to the Church, as a supposed tyrannical power. "Faith is a free thing," says Luther somewhere, "which can not be forced on any body." Even Tertullian, amidst the persecutions of the second century, told the heathens who tried to force the Christians to offer sacrifices to their idols: "It belongs to the human right and natural power of every one (*humani juris et naturalis potestatis est unicuique*) to worship that God in whom he believes. It is not the nature of religion to enforce religion; for it must be freely accepted, not imposed by power. Even the sacrifices must proceed from a willing heart. If you, therefore, compel us to offer sacrifices, it will be of no advantage to your gods." This is precisely the American theory and practice.

The defects and abuses of American Christianity which abound in every sect, prove indeed that the voluntary principle can not do away altogether with those evils which are often falsely attributed to the system of compulsion and State-Churchism as such. For fallen human nature is substantially the same under all governments. It revealed its corruption even in the apostolical congregations in spite of the extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit, as every epistle of the New Testament and the state of the seven churches as described in the Apocalypse abundantly show. But the natural tendency at least of the voluntary principle is undoubtedly to ward off from the Church that odium which invariably arises from its alliance with the police; to diminish hypocrisy; to prevent the monstrous profanation of the holy sacraments so common in religious establishments; to separate heterogeneous elements; to facilitate discipline; and to promote the unity and purity of the various Churches within their own limits. Whether these

advantages outweigh the defects of the voluntary system, and the advantages of the Church-State system, I must leave to the European brethren to decide.

3. *Self-support of the Church.*

Another consequence of the separation of Church and State is what is more particularly called the voluntary principle, that is, the necessity of the Church to provide for her own support by the free contributions of her membership, without any taxes imposed by the State. For by depriving itself of all power of control over the Church, the civil government regards itself relieved also of the duty of supporting it, except in the few cases of military and naval chaplains.

In this respect American Christianity is placed on the same footing with the apostolic and anti-nicene Church, with that important advantage, however, that it is not *religio illicita*, but has a legal existence and enjoys the protection of the State as to its property and the public exercise of its functions.

This trait, too, like every other characteristic feature of religion in this country, has two sides. The disadvantages of the voluntary principle are innumerable vexations and annoyances to ministers and theological professors, at least in such congregations which are weak and poor or illiberal and mean—of which there are not a few—or whose membership consists mostly of European immigrants, accustomed to look to the State for the support of religion; the great disproportion in the contributions as compared with the wealth of the donors; and finally the overloading of ecclesiastical assemblies and synodical minutes with financial business, which, instead of tending to edification, exerts unquestionably more or less a secularizing influence. The advantages, on the other side, are the removal of the odium connected with State-Church-taxation; the promotion of attachment of the supporting members to the Church of their choice on the principle, where their money is there is their interest; and above all, the development of habitual, systematic benevolence, which should be regarded as an essen-

tial duty and privilege of the Christian as much so as prayer and attendance on the means of grace.

The objection which is frequently made to the system by Europeans, that it makes the ministry disgracefully dependent on the congregation, I must deny as entirely unfounded, as far as my observation of things in this country goes. For the American admires no trait of character more than manly independence and consistency, and esteems, loves and supports a minister in the same degree in which he discharges the solemn duties of his office faithfully and conscientiously as an ambassador of Christ without fear and favor of man. This at least may be regarded as the rule in all the respectable denominations of the land. The tone of preaching in America is upon the whole more free and bold, I think, than in Europe, and yet no profession is more esteemed and more influential here than the clerical. The only real sufferers of the voluntary system under this aspect, are the clerical mercenaries, idlers and loafers, and they deserve to suffer, so that the individual loss is a general gain to the congregation and the reputation of the ministry. So much, however, must be admitted, that the successful discharge of ministerial duties in a republic like the one we speak of, requires a far higher degree of prudence and caution in the treatment of the individual members of the congregation, and in abstaining from all improper intermeddling with secular affairs, such as party politics, than is the case under monarchical governments.

As to the practical execution of the voluntary principle, America presents, of course, the greatest contrast. There are congregations in every denomination, who, as far as in them lies, literally "starve out" their ministers, as the phrase is, and I know many a worthy German clergyman, especially in the new settlements of the West, who has to make greater sacrifices with his family than the foreign missionaries who can at least depend upon a regular support from the society in whose service they labor. On the other side, there are congregations, though "few and far

between," who give the ministers, in addition to a regular salary of from three to five thousand dollars, quite a handsome Christmas or New Year's-gift, buy him a fine house or farm, and pay all his expenses for an occasional trip to Europe for the benefit of his health. Some congregations, as the Episcopal Trinity Corporation and the Dutch Reformed Collegiate Church of New York, have come in possession of an immense income by legacies, the rise of real property, or perhaps by speculation of more than doubtful propriety. Experience, however, teaches that large wealth is rarely favorable to the spiritual prosperity of a congregation and has a tendency to lower the standard of liberality among the members. There are rich Americans who give nothing, or a mere trifle, to God in return for his innumerable daily blessings; but there are also others who cheerfully devote more than the tenth of their income to religious and benevolent purposes and prosper only the more for it. I could mention not a few names who have immortalized themselves, not by legacies on the dying bed, but during their life-time, when they could enjoy their wealth, by truly princely donations of thousands and hundred thousands to the Bible—the Tract—the Missionary—the Colonization causes, to Theological Seminaries, Colleges, the building of churches, and other good objects. It must be admitted, that so far New England has stood at the head in the virtue of liberality. It is a remarkable fact, however, that the Unitarians of Boston are fully as liberal as their orthodox neighbors, not indeed, for the church and theology, which is a subordinate interest with them, but for education and philanthropy.* It would be idle to deny the restless and inordinate thirst for wealth, the over valuation of tem-

* Quite recently the London banker, George Peabody, a native of Massachusetts, and now on a visit to this country, donated, besides a number of smaller sums to various objects, \$350,000 to the city of Baltimore, where he laid the foundation of his immense wealth, for the erection of a scientific institute. Another American, Mr. Cooper, a Unitarian, I believe, erects at present, not with the stiffened hand of bequest, but in the vigor of life, immense buildings in New York for a sort of University, which must have cost him already not far from half a million.

poral prosperity and comfort, the large amount of wild speculation and dishonest swindling, which characterizes American life, especially since the annexation of California and the unexampled rise of the new States in the West. But it would be equally unjust to deny the Americans the credit of a large amount of liberality, benevolence and generosity, and if it was not for this and the power of Christianity generally, the cursed worship of the golden calf would undoubtedly ruin the nation in a short time.

The average salary of the Protestant clergy in the United States is supposed to be from \$400 to \$500 per annum. There is at present much complaint made about the inadequate support of the ministry in these times of expensive living. Innumerable newspaper articles, and several books have been written on the subject. It has also been discussed and acted upon in ecclesiastical assemblies. So much may be said to be certain that the same amount of talent, education, zeal, labor and moral worth, which characterizes the American clergy, would command a much higher temporal reward in any other profession or occupation in so prosperous a country as this.

Taking, however, all things into consideration, we may perhaps be surprised rather, that so much is done in this respect. The comparative success of the voluntary system may, upon the whole, be regarded as the greatest glory of American Christianity. The Free Church of Scotland alone, with its heroic sacrifices, deserves the same, perhaps still greater praise. Next to it come the dissenting bodies in England, especially the Methodists, who are reported to raise larger sums annually for missionary purposes than the entire Church of England. But the Continent of Europe has nothing to be compared with it. I was told a few years ago by some of the most distinguished men in Germany, France, and Switzerland, that the withdrawal of the government support would bring perhaps more than one half of the preachers and theological professors on the brink of starvation, at least for the moment. Now, in contrast to

this admission, I ask you to consider the fact that the Americans not only sustain, with their voluntary contributions, without any aid from the government, all their ministers, domestic and foreign missionaries, the operations of the Bible—Tract—and other societies, but erect and repair also innumerable houses of worship, establish theological seminaries, colleges, academies, support poor students for the gospel ministry and encourage a hundred other benevolent objects of a local, sectional and general character.

I beg leave to prove my assertion with a few statistical facts. You have heard, no doubt, of the great spiritual destitution among the hundreds of thousands of German immigrants, especially in the new settlements of the western States. The same complaint is made by the Roman Catholics with regard to the equally numerous Irish immigrants. This is all perfectly true, and has its reason partly in the enormous tide of immigration from Germany and Ireland, with which the education of ministers in a few feeble seminaries cannot possibly keep pace, and partly in the poverty of these foreigners, a large number of whom have first to struggle for a material existence. But no inference should be made from this as to the average supply of the country with the means of grace. This, on the contrary, surpasses that of many established Churches in Europe. According to the official census report of 1850, there were at that time in the United States twenty-six thousand eight hundred and forty-two ministers of the gospel (not including the numerous local, or lay-preachers of the Methodist bodies), i. e., more than one for a thousand souls; thirty-eight thousand, one hundred and eighty-three houses of worship, estimated at eighty-seven million four hundred and forty-six thousand seven hundred and seventy-one dollars, and furnishing accommodation for fourteen millions two hundred and seventy thousand one hundred and thirty-nine persons, i. e., for more than the half of the population, which, in 1850, numbered twenty-

three millions one hundred and ninety-one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five; while even the rich and highly favored Church of England, according to the census report of 1851, had accommodation only for five millions three hundred and seventeen thousand nine hundred and fifteen souls, to which must be added four millions eight hundred and ninety-four thousand six hundred and forty-eight sittings of dissenting chapels, thus making the total number of sittings at the highest estimation, ten million two hundred and twelve thousand five hundred and sixty-three for a population of seventeen million nine hundred and twenty seven thousand six hundred and nine (for England and Wales).* A comparison with the Continent of Europe gives a result still more favorable to the United States. Paris had, in 1855, only forty-six churches for a population of one million one hundred thousand souls; this, on an average, would hardly give one house of worship to twenty-three thousand souls; but the disproportion was so great that the fourth district numbered forty-five thousand nine hundred inhabitants and only one church. In Berlin, with all its recent zeal for Church extension, the state of things in this respect is not much better, in Hamburg perhaps still worse. Let us now take some statistical facts of a few American cities from Lippincott's reliable Gazetteer for 1855. In 1853 the city of New York had a population of five hundred and fifteen thousand five hundred and forty-seven and no less than two hundred and fifty four houses of worship (viz: forty-four Episcopalian, thirty-seven Presbyterian, nineteen Dutch Reformed, thirty-seven Methodist, thirty-two Baptist, six Congregational, six Lutheran, twenty-two Roman Catholic, two Unitarian, etc.); Brooklyn had sixty-six churches for one hundred and twenty-five thousand inhabitants; Philadelphia, with four hundred and eight thousand seven hundred and eighty-two souls, numbered

* Religious Worship in England and Wales. Abridged from the official reports made by Horace Mann to George Graham, Registrar General. London. 1854. p. 57, ff.

two hundred and seventy-five places of public worship (viz: sixty-two Presbyterian, Old and New School, together with the smaller branches, thirty-eight Episcopalian, sixty-six Methodist, twenty-seven Baptist, twelve Lutheran, ten Dutch and German Reformed, twenty-one Roman Catholic, etc).

We may, therefore, boldly assert that, so far, the system of ecclesiastical self-support has fully justified itself in the United States. Church extension has kept pace with the increase of population in the cities and villages and new settlements of the West. A few years ago the Congregationalists alone raised in one day, if I recollect aright, one hundred thousand dollars, for the building of churches in the missionary charges of the great West; a year afterwards the New School Presbyterians did the same; and thus one general effort of two denominations facilitated the erection of several hundred houses of worship in the new States and Territories. It is true, our houses of worship are not Byzantine and Gothic cathedrals, (although even such have been erected within the last ten and twenty years not only by Roman Catholics, but also by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and even Baptists and Unitarians); but they are generally better adapted to the wants of Protestant worship, which addresses itself mainly to the ear and intellect through the preaching of the Word, than the colossal structures of mediæval Catholicism, which makes much account of imposing ceremonies and operates chiefly through the eye upon the imagination. The American churches, whatever be their defects in an artistic and æsthetic point of view, are generally comfortable and kept warm during the cold season. This, no doubt, contributes to secure a regular attendance, while the chilling cold in the huge churches of the Continent keep off thousands of people during the winter. In addition to this, the American, with characteristic freedom and boldness, frequently converts school-houses, streets, market-places, meadows and groves into temples, and stones, steps, store-boxes and stumps into pulpits.

As to the numerical relation of pastors and churches, the collegiate system, so frequent in Europe, is very rare here, and where it exists, it is apt to foment envy, jealousy and party spirit. Generally speaking, a charge has but one minister who then feels the whole responsibility resting upon him. Experience teaches that this is upon the whole the best system. But in communion seasons, where the services are generally protracted for several days, it is customary to invite the assistance of neighboring brethren. It is also a part of clerical courtesy to offer the pulpit to a travelling minister in good standing, though he be of a different denomination. The writer of this, for instance, preached often in Reformed, Lutheran, Presbyterian, occasionally also in Episcopal and other churches. There is far more freedom and friendly intercourse in this respect in America, than even in England, where, till quite recently, not even a foreign Episcopalian was permitted to officiate in the established Church, not to speak of the Continent, where similar prohibitions more or less rigorous, exist to this day.

In regard to Church extension and the multiplication of parishes, German governments, especially in the growing capitals, might learn a good lesson from the zeal and activity of American Christians. But it would be altogether premature to make the comparative success of the voluntary principle in America an argument for its introduction in Europe. For it must be kept in mind, that the reward of labor and the general prosperity of the people is much greater in the United States than in the old world, with its thicker population and less rapid motion; secondly, that the Americans, by the nature of their young and growing country and by long habit, are more accustomed to pecuniary contributions for all sorts of public improvements than the continental Europeans; and, finally, that the Protestant Churches of Germany, for instance, have a just claim upon the State for support, because the government secularized their large property and thus of course assumed

the sacred duty of allowing the Church at least a part of her own original revenue.

4. *Self-government of the Church.*

For the trouble of self-support the American Churches enjoy the full right of self-government, and thus differ widely from the various forms of Caesaropapism, or as the English generally call it, Erastianism, which, in every Protestant country of Europe, lodges the supreme government of the national religion in the temporal head.

Here American Protestantism runs parallel with the political self-government of the nation, and is considerably influenced by its parliamentary forms. We must, therefore, say a few words on the latter, in order to place this important feature in a clear light for the European mind.

The American republic rests throughout on the basis of *self-government*, and would not last six weeks without it. This truly English word * signifies in a general way the political maturity of the people on the basis of the moral self-control of its individual citizens. It enables and entitles them to take an active part in the legislation and administration of public affairs, but in an organic way and by a proportionate number of representatives, not as a chaotic mass, like the degenerate Athenian market-democracy after the time of Cleon, the tanner, or the French *peuple-empereur*, of revolutionary memory, which is only a boastful name for mobocracy. Self-government always implies

*Dr. Francis Lieber, an Americanized German, who, strange to say, wrote the best work extant on "Civil Liberty and Self-government," (Philadelphia, 1853, in 2 vols.), directs attention to the fact (I, p. 207) that this "proud word," doubtless an imitation of the Greek *autonomy*, was originally used in a moral sense by the divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; that subsequently it seems to have been dropped for a time, but reappeared again towards the end of the last century, both in England and the United States, and is now used as far as Anglian liberty prevails. You look in vain for it either in Johnson's or even in Webster's Dictionary, among the many words compounded with self. Dr. Worcester has it but marked with a star, which denotes that he added it to Dr. Johnson's, and gives *Paley* as authority, which Dr. Lieber assures us is an error. The *self*, in this word, signifies the object of government, and has, therefore, a reflexive meaning; while in *autocrat*, *Selbst-herrscher*, *self-ruler*, as applied to the Russian Czar, it is used in the substantive and exclusive sense (he who rules alone, and nobody else).

two apparently opposite, but in fact complementary elements, liberty and loyalty, sense of independence and love of order, manly self-respect and respect for others, coöperation in the making of new laws and obedience to the existing laws until they are constitutionally repealed. It secures the rule of the majority, but fully as much also the sacred rights of the minority and a lawful opposition ; for this, in a free government, like the English and the American, is generally the guardian of the popular liberties and puts a wholesome restraint upon the majority, thus keeping it from the abuse of power to which weak human nature is always exposed. It goes on the assumption that there is no right without a corresponding duty, no liberty without the supremacy of law, no power without self-limitation. For this reason self-government, in its various ramifications from the general departments down to the municipal and domestic, which, like the tender fibers of a living organism, reach to the extremities, constitutes the firmest, yea, the only base of free institutions and a bulwark against revolution ; while centralized despotism, whether individual or collective, monarchical or republican, is indeed the simplest and as long as it lasts, the strongest, but at the same time the unsafest form of government, which may be overthrown by the shot of a pistol successfully aimed at the despot's brain.

Self-government has its natural root in the Germanic, especially the Anglo-Saxon nationality, and was developed and matured under the influence of Protestantism during the severe struggles which agitated England for the greater part of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and which gave rise to the first and most influential settlements in North America. We may say, self-government is Protestantism itself, viewed as a social and political principle, or the general kingship as an emanation of the general priesthood of true Christians. It is the soul of the Anglican liberties and their guarantee against anarchy and dissolution. It is the secret of the gigantic power of the English nation

which now rules, from its island-fortress, over five millions of square miles and more than two hundred millions of souls, that is one fifth of the population of the globe. It is the strength and glory of the Anglo-Saxon republic. It explains the astounding fact that the people of the United States of America enjoy the highest degree of security for their lives and property without a standing army; for the immense country has not half the number of regular troops as the city of Paris alone, or even Berlin; and these ten thousand soldiers are mostly stationed on the Indian frontiers, so that you might travel for days and weeks through the States without seeing a uniform or a bayonet. They cannot do without a police, of course; but the police men of American cities, like the constables of London, are not armed, and not even distinguished by peculiar dress, for they are there for no other purpose than "to assist the people, and the people are ever ready to assist them;" while on the continent of Europe, the military and the police seem to maintain a threatening attitude to the people, as if they needed the constant watch and superintendence of the cocked hats. The word which Napoleon III spoke at what is called the fête of the eagles, in 1852: "The history of nations is in great part the history of armies," may be true of France, but fortunately it is absolutely inapplicable to the United States.

The American self-government celebrates its greatest triumph every four years, on the fifth of November, in the universal calm which succeeds the storm of the Presidential election. During the summer and autumn of last year the thirty one States, from Maine to Florida, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, were divided into three hostile armies, a Democratic, a Republican, and a Know-Nothing or Native American; each of them strained every effort to secure the vote of the people for its own candidate; the most retired villages, as well as the cities, were carried away with the national excitement and resounded with political speeches; some ministers even—though not to their credit of course

—“took the stump” and mixed in the wild warfare; and many false prophets foretold the inevitable dissolution of the Union, unless the candidate of their choice were elected. But when the fourth of November arrived, the people marched in quiet majesty to the polls, to decide the battle, and when on the day following the result became known, through countless telegraphs, the beaten minority submitted to the *vox Dei* as it had spoken through the *vox populi*, without dreaming of a revolution, or even the possibility of a *coup d'état* after the French fashion, and every branch of business went on as if nothing had happened. And yet not only was a new President elected, but according to the doubtful maxim, “To the victors belong the spoils,” which, at Marcy’s suggestion, has been in operation since Jackson’s administration, the whole army of federal office-holders was placed upon the resignation-list, to make room for a tenfold greater army of office-seekers. I doubt whether any country, England excepted, could stand every fourth year such an unbloody general political revolution without running into anarchy, and without falling at last into the iron grasp of military despotism as the only means of restoring public order.

We freely admit that the American self-government is often put to the severest test, and that with the fullest enjoyment of rational freedom we have also a large amount of libertinism, its hideous counterfeit. It is a painful fact that most of our large cities, especially New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, abound in lawless “rowdies,” who not only give vent occasionally to their wild passions in bloody street riots, but control even to a certain extent the fire-companies, and exert a considerable influence at the primary meetings in the nomination (which as far as the party is concerned is tantamount to an election) of candidates for the municipal offices, for seats in the State legislatures, and at times perhaps even for Congress. It is a fact that disgraceful excesses frequently take place at our elections, and that the politics of the country generally, at least in its

lower branches, without distinction of party, is awfully corrupt and contaminated by the meanest selfishness, bribery, slander and falsehood. No wonder that thousands of the best and most orderly citizens turn away from it in disgust and abstain from voting, to the injury of the public interests. Many occurrences of the last few years, above all the scandalous troubles in the newly organized territory of Kansas, which, owing to the interminable slavery question, in connection with the approaching Presidential election, was for some time, on the very brink of civil war and demanded the interference of the military force, are indelible spots in the annals of this proud nation. While I am writing, the peace of New York, where "*cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt celebranturque*," to a greater extent even than in Rome at the time of Tacitus, is jeopardized by a serious conflict between the old city police and the new State authority, so that possibly the orderly citizens may be forced at last, like those of San Francisco, in 1856, to the desperate remedy of a vigilance committee and temporary suspension of the ordinary wheels of government.

Such phenomena must fill the heart of every American patriot with humiliation and grief, and may well undermine for a moment his faith in the capacity of the masses for self-government and the ultimate success of this republic. So much is certain that nothing can permanently secure the American liberties but the Christian religion and its moral influence on the people.

But, on the other hand, we should never form our judgment from momentary impressions and single events. These anarchical outbreaks, compared with the general state of society in America, are after all but as a drop in the bucket. The great mass of the American people are unquestionably conservative, orderly and peaceable. Yea, if we take into proper consideration the awful corruption of human nature, and the fact that the large cities and new settlements of the United States, where by far the most of

these excesses occur, contain in connection with the best elements of society, the very offscouring of all nations in Christendom, including the American, unrestrained by a standing army, or even a sufficient police-force, we should be surprised rather that the violations of the public order are not much more frequent and of a far more dangerous character. If we observe, moreover, that order and peace are always restored after every such outbreak of a disorderly spirit; that the sound sense of the people speedily and successfully reacts against these excrescences; that, in spite of unprincipled and selfish demagogues, who disgrace the city councils, the legislatures, and at times even Congress itself, the country prospers, progresses and enjoys upon the whole as much security of person and property as Germany, France or England: the desponding fears concerning the future should give place to cheerful hopes and the firm conviction of the steady, though often interrupted progress of history in the path of true liberty. Sober reflection and impartial consideration will lead at last to the conclusion that self-government is after all no empty dream or vain boast, but a fact, the greatest and most imposing fact in the social and political life of the English race, and especially of the republic of the United States.

The same judgment may be applied to the religious and ecclesiastical life of America. However numerous the instances of disorder and confusion, especially among the more radical sects, it is nevertheless a fact, a most important fact, that the Protestantism of this country is characterized, upon the whole, by a degree of self-government, a capacity of managing its own affairs in a popular way and taking care of its general interests without any assistance from government, as no Protestant Church in Europe, unless it be the Free Kirk of Scotland.

There is here, first of all, a free, well organized, Christian congregation consisting of voluntary professors of religion, as distinct from an accidental heap of passive nominal Christians which meets us so often in the State-Churches

of Europe under the name of a congregation or parish. There are in America innumerable congregations with a constitution based upon the Bible and one of the great confessions of the reformation period; electing their pastor from the regularly ordained ministers of the denomination to which they belong, not as a hireling, but as their divinely appointed and ecclesiastically sanctioned spiritual-head; associating with him as assistants a number of elders and deacons from the most worthy and zealous members; exercising discipline against gross offenders; managing their affairs in the fear of God, with prayer, calmness and well-drilled business tact, under the official presidency of the minister and according to the constitution; and taking an active part in all the general interests of the kingdom of God. Contrast with this a congregation of German immigrants, especially one that is independent of any Lutheran or Reformed Synod, assembled to consult on their local concerns: and there you will behold a motley mixture representing the various shades of belief and unbelief of the mother country; suddenly emancipated from the maternal control of the State-Church-system; compelled to take care of themselves without the capacity of doing so; every one anxious to rule and none willing to obey; a chaotic mass destitute of public spirit, talent of organization and parliamentary tact; hiring some clerical mercenary or vagabond, yet suspiciously excluding him from a seat in the consistory; and after much useless and pointless talk breaking up in hopeless confusion, unless some prudent and self-denying German minister, or some benevolent American friend should succeed by his cool self-possession, meekness and patience, to keep them together and lead them into the path of order, until they are Americanized in the best sense of the term, i. e., enabled to rule themselves.

This contrast is not overdrawn. It is a singular fact, that while the German stands unrivalled for freedom, independence and boldness in the sphere of science and speculation, and excels also by peculiar excellences in a religious

point of view, he should be so far behind the Englishman and American in all that pertains to political and ecclesiastical self-government. But the simple cause lies in his want of training in this direction; for self-government, like every other art, must be gradually acquired. It is impossible to learn to ride without handling horse and bridle, or to swim without venturing into the water. It may be a dangerous thing to emancipate the congregation in those countries, where the civil community, and not the voluntary profession of religion, is the basis of the Christian congregation, and the danger is increased when indifference and infidelity prevail. The above contrast shows that a sudden emancipation from the accustomed control of the higher authorities would lead to endless confusion. But, on the other side, it will hardly be denied that the Protestant idea of the general priesthood of believers, if true at all, must lead to a certain degree of congregational independence or self-government, and to an active coöperation of the laity with the ministry. The American experience proves, beyond contradiction, that such kind of congregationalism, (I take it here in its theological, not in its technical denominational sense) instead of injuring the interests of the Church and religion and undermining the influence of the ministry, greatly promotes them. Hence we heartily wish God's blessing to descend upon all the efforts now made by the Church authorities of Prussia and other parts of Germany, to revive true congregational life, by introducing the office of lay-presbyters and lay-deacons, where it does not already exist. The process may be slow; but every solid building must begin with the foundation. The effect will be good in the end and may greatly benefit also the German Churches of America, through the improved character of the immigrants. Already there is a manifest difference between those Germans who come from a free congregational life, as it prevails, for instance, in the Wupperthal, and those who were brought up in the system of absolute passivity.

For this capacity of popular self-government in the

Church, America is indebted, no doubt, to the consistent development of the Reformed element, partly in its Presbyterian, partly in its Congregational form.

In connection with this congregational maturity and activity, we have also in the United States a true synodical life. Our regular annual or semi-annual meetings of Presbyteries or Classes, Synods, and General Assemblies or Conventions, serve the same purpose as the free pastoral conferences and the Church Diet for Germany, being bodies for the promotion of unity and all the general interests of the kingdom of God in and through its different branches or visible churches. But in addition to this, they are also, at least in the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, legislative bodies, and thus answer, at the same time, to the consistories and other ecclesiastical tribunals in the German State-Churches. Their resolutions are not recommendations simply, but legal enactments, to be obeyed by all the ministers and congregations represented. To them belong the final settlement of disciplinary questions, the control of theological schools, the examination and ordination of candidates for the ministry, the support of the education-cause, of domestic and foreign missions, and the encouragement of every enterprise that pertains to the external and internal prosperity of the Church. These meetings give annually a powerful impulse to the activity of ministers and people, and are a special blessing to the communities in which they convene, and from which they receive in return the kindest hospitality.

The same self-government, parliamentary tact, love of order, and public spirit, that characterize the meetings of the local congregations, attach, in a still higher degree, to these synodical bodies, together with a very considerable amount of oratorical talent. It is true, the weakness of human nature reveals itself here also in various ways. There is always danger of an excess of legislation, of hasty resolutions, which remain a dead letter, and a useless display of eloquence. But have ecclesiastical assemblies—not to speak of political ones—ever been free from such exerecscen-

ces? Does not Gregory of Nazianzen, who himself presided for some time over the second oecumenical council at Constantinople, bring more serious charges against the great synodical meetings of the Nicene age? Was there not "much disputing" even in the apostolical council at Jerusalem, before they reached that wise conclusion concerning the relation of the Gentile converts to the law of Moses? And did not even St. Paul get into an open collision with St. Peter before the assembled congregation of Antioch? Human imperfection enters into the very sanctuary of the Church militant, and the celestial treasure is committed to earthen vessels, that no flesh should boast and all glory be given to God alone.

One of the most important features in the evangelical Synods of America is the lay-element. It flows from the protestant idea of the general priesthood, and forms the best check upon the hierarchical spirit, which Gregory of Nazianzen charges as one of the worst faults upon the old Catholic councils, and against which even St. Peter found it necessary to warn the elders of the apostolical congregation. The fundamental principle of Anglican liberty: "No taxation without representation," is characteristic also of American Christianity. It thoroughly disowns the view that the Church is identical with the clergy, and that the congregation is doomed to blind obedience. The ministers take the lead, of course, in all ecclesiastical matters, except the financial, and will always do so because of their superior knowledge and zeal. But the lay deputies are by no means passive spectators; they have generally the same number of votes and often take the most lively interest in all synodical transactions, even those of a purely theological character. They are chosen from the most worthy elders of the congregations, and a genuine American congregation, I must repeat it, is not a motley heap of a few dozen converted disciples and several hundred baptized heathens, but a well organized body of living Christians. Such laymen are never dangerous in Synods, but exert almost invariably a salutary conservative influence.

The lay representation in connection with the Presbyterian form of government, is most fully carried out in the various branches of the Reformed communion of Dutch, Scotch, English, and German origin. But even the organization of the Episcopal Church, which, of all Protestant denominations, approaches nearest the Roman hierarchy, has undergone a very significant modification in this country, by admitting a regular lay delegation, equal in number to the clerical representation, into its diocesan conventions, and into the lower house of its triennial general conventions (the upper house is exclusively composed of bishops). As far as I know, the American Episcopalians are not likely ever to give up this popular feature in their ecclesiastical polity. Even in the mother Church of England it has recently found warm advocates, and it is more than probable that it will be incorporated at some future day in the contemplated reorganization of the convocations, which at present have a mere nominal existence, the government of the Church being in the hands of parliament and the privy council.

There are, however, two important exceptions to this rule in America, which we cannot pass by unnoticed. Methodism and Romanism, although diametrically opposed to each other, agree in the exclusion of the laity from all participation in the government of the Church.

The former gives rise, for this very reason, to occasional protests and secessions in the United States as well as in England. Of these seceders the Protestant Methodists are the most important. But the purely clerical government of the Methodist Episcopal Church does not rest on a hierarchical basis, and is merely a matter of policy connected with its missionary character. Moreover, what it refuses the laity in the sphere of discipline, it restores to them in the department of worship by the important institution of lay, or local preachers, class-leaders, and in the weekly prayer meetings, where the laymen are permitted to make the largest use of the general priesthood. Hence its peculiar and very efficient organization does not prevent it from

being one of the most numerous and popular denominations of the country; it marches in the van of the great westward tide of American emigration, preaching every where with great earnestness, repentance and faith, and exciting the flame of practical piety.

Very different is the position of the Roman Catholic Church. This ancient and unchangeable body maintains, of course, also in the United States its old ground, that the clergy is the Church, and regards the Christian people merely as the sandy plain on which the colossal pyramid of the hierarchy rests. As the first Napoleon, the greatest and most genial incarnation of absolute despotism, made it his maxim: "Every thing for the people, (i. e., in his sense for himself, *l' état c'est moi*), nothing by the people": so the Roman Church says: Every thing for the congregation, nothing by the congregation. But by this very principle it stands in direct opposition to the national genius of America, which, in religion, as well as in politics, follows the maxim: Every thing for the people, nothing without the people. The absolute papacy, as well as the Napoleonic military despotism, which sees only common soldiers under the emperor general, may indeed easily connect itself with a certain kind of democracy. The hierarchical pyramid requires a dead level to show off in its grandeur. But the people here are not a living organism, with inherent rights and liberties, but a dependent mass, moving only at the absolute command of the priesthood. In her relation to the State, the Roman Church enjoys in this republic perfect liberty and independence, and can exercise her hierarchical self-government, if we may so call it, to the fullest extent. In this respect her condition is even more favorable than under the Roman Catholic governments of Europe, which are all more or less tinctured with Gallicanism. But she meets here with a more powerful opponent in public opinion, and the genius of free America, which is thoroughly Protestant with all its religious, social and political institutions, sympathies and tendencies. Hence we need not be surprised that Romanism, with all its undoubted growth,

has not been able to keep pace with the immense immigration of Irish and German Catholics, which, within the last twenty years has been perhaps twice as large as the entire present membership of this Church. Still less has it been able, with all its imposing cathedrals, sisters of charity, and well organized benevolent institutions, to gain the sympathies of the people. On the contrary, just in proportion as the papacy extended, the American spirit has risen against it, and recently produced even a powerful political party, called the Know-Nothing or American party, which is professedly based upon hatred of Romanists and foreigners, and has for its object to destroy their political influence. This Know-Nothingism spread, in 1856, with lightening rapidity all over the Union and threatened for a while to absorb the old Whig party and to annihilate the Democratic party then in power, until it was most signally defeated in the last Presidential election, being forced to succumb to anti-slavery republicanism in the North and to the democracy in the South. Its proscriptive spirit is directly opposed to the fundamental American principle of the political equality of all Christian sects. But for this very reason it reveals the more strikingly the irreconcilable antagonism between Romanism and native Americanism, as intelligent Catholics, especially the able dialectician, Brownson, the only really important American convert to that Church, have on several occasions reluctantly admitted. It would be absolutely impossible to organize a political party against any Protestant denomination of the country. For Mormonism, which is still more unpopular than Romanism, does not belong to Protestantism in any sense whatever, and has much more affinity with Mohammedanism than with Christianity. The future must show whether the Roman Church, with her unyielding tenacity, will be able ultimately to resist the powerful Protestant current of this country, or whether she will be carried away by it and undergo an important process of transformation.

The United States of North America is the most Protestant country in Christendom. Even its toleration, which

Romanism likewise enjoys, and should by all means be permitted to enjoy without the least molestation, is a legitimate fruit of Protestantism, and operates upon the whole more against than in favor of Romanism. The United States is the greatest world-and church-historical conquest which has been made by the genius of the Reformation since the sixteenth century, and which far outweighs all the Roman acquisitions of baptized heathenism and barbarism in South America. North America is, therefore, emphatically a land of hope for Protestantism, not negative, rationalistic and pantheistic, but positive, scriptural, evangelical catholic Protestantism, which takes its stand on Christ and his everlasting Gospel as the only source of salvation and the only guarantee of true civil and religious freedom.

Here we must bring our report to a close. We sensibly feel its imperfections and incompleteness in view of the mass of material which might claim our attention. Much might be said on American theology, which for German taste is rather too dry and mechanical, somewhat unchurchly and, as to the doctrine of the holy Sacraments, even rationalizing, but which, in other respects, is strictly scriptural and confessional, better adapted to the intelligence of the people and the wants of the congregation, than the German, and promises to produce a new phase in the sacred science by combining German learning and research with English orthodoxy and solidity ;—on the many theological seminaries and the method of theological study, which, in the United States, is not as thorough, comprehensive and free as in Germany, but safer and more practical, since it is not entered upon simply as a profession and for a decent support, but from religious motives, and hence conducted with the view to a growth in piety as well as in learning, and with constant regard to the pastoral office in a particular denomination ;—on the innumerable religious papers, magazines and reviews, which represent all possible shades of piety and fanaticism and carry in hundreds of thousands of copies truth and falsehood to the most distant dwelling ;

—on the Christian life, which has a predominantly Reformed stamp, full of vigor, energy and enterprise, and presents all the excellencies and defects of a practical common sense Christianity, more broad than deep, strong in outward action and weak in inward meditation, laying hold of the understanding and will, rather than the imagination and feeling, running frequently into the errors of Phariseism and legalism, but very rarely into the opposite extreme of Sadduceaism and antinomianism, to which the German mind is exposed;—or the American celebration of the Lord's Day, which, with all its Judaizing and legalistic features, is an imposing weekly testimony of the nation's reverence for God's holy law, a mighty bulwark of public religion and virtue, and in its practical workings infinitely preferable to the European pseudo-evangelical laxity;—on the American pulpit, which, whatever be its defects as compared with the European, is upon the whole, perhaps, superior to it, and must be said to be free, bold, energetic and decidedly evangelical in its tone, rousing the conscience with great earnestness and power, urging repentance and faith in Christ and a holy walk and conversation, shedding the light of God's word upon all the important questions of society and exerting more influence for good upon public opinion than the combined power of the press;—on the extensive activity of free associations, as the Bible, Tract, Sunday School, and African Colonization Societies, which rise superior to our sectarian divisions and distractions and present a field for united action to the various evangelical denominations;—on the growing missionary zeal of the leading Churches which follows the western tide of emigration to the base of the Rocky Mountains and the shores of the Pacific, supplying the new settlements with the means of grace, and which sends, at the same time, the messengers of the cross to the heathen on the Sandwich Islands, in China and the East Indies, to the negroes on the western coast of Africa, and to the stagnant sects of the decaying Turkish empire, extending to the ven-

erable seats of primitive Christianity and binding thus the extreme west to the ancient east by the gospel of love and peace. All this and many other things I can merely allude to; for a detailed account would not only transcend the limits of this report, which I would like to condense still more, if I had time, but also lead me into the field of the inner divisions and controversies of Protestantism, and these the Evangelical Alliance would rather forget for a moment in the enjoyment of that deeper unity and harmony, which, after all, underlies the various branches of evangelical Christendom.

For the same reasons I can only make one short remark on the most difficult problem of American statesmanship and philanthropy, which, in addition to its political and social bearing, presents also a very important moral and religious aspect and connects itself with the ultimate Christianization and civilization of Africa. Although there is little prospect of a speedy cure of the sore evil of negro slavery, which preys upon the very vitals of the American Union and threatens its dissolution, it will as certainly be healed in due time, as its root, the African slave trade, and slavery itself in all the northern States, was abolished. This desirable result, however, will not be attained by any undue foreign interference, which a nation as sensitive and high minded as the American will either indignantly repulse, or ignore; nor by political agitation, which so far at least has rather thrown back the process of emancipation and called forth a fanatical pro-slavery reaction in the southern States; nor by a dissolution of the Union and the terrors of a civil war, which may God in mercy prevent; but it will be brought about partly by the silent influence of physical and material causes, such as climate, agriculture, industry, railroads; partly by the irresistible progress of Christianity, humanity and freedom; and especially by the adorable wisdom of the almighty ruler of events, who makes even the wrath of men to praise him, who delivered Israel from the bondage of Egypt, and of Babylon, and who will in his own good time

gloriously solve this dark mystery by the elevation and salvation of the entire African race.

Yea, Jesus Christ, by whom all men were created and redeemed, will, according to the sure word of prophecy, raise at last his banner of freedom and peace over all nations and races, over all continents and islands, and heaven and earth shall resound with the triumphal song: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." His visible Church is still unfortunately divided by human guilt, though not without wise providential design, into many hostile camps; yet in the deepest source of her spiritual life and in her invisible head she is but one, and when each division, be it Protestant, or Roman, or Greek, shall have fully accomplished its separate mission, the hidden unity of life will also visibly appear arrayed in the beauty of infinite variety. Before this paper can reach the capital of Prussia, the transatlantic telegraph will bind the two hemispheres together, and Europeans and Americans will be no more antipodes, but neighbors. Who would have dreamed, twenty years ago, of such wonders in the natural world? And why should not the invisibly omnipresent power of divine love be able to unite the most distant parts of Christendom, for which it bled on the cross, into one, holy, catholic brotherhood of faith and love?

May the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance strengthen the consciousness of present unity in the midst of strife, give a fresh impulse to Christian zeal and activity, and help to prepare the way for a true and abiding union of believers of all countries and nations, all tongues and confessions, in Him who is their common Lord and Saviour!

With this wish and prayer I transmit to you, dear brethren, being unable to appear among you in person, this written contribution to your feast of love, hoping that under the blessing of God it may contain some comfort and encouragement to the faith of the evangelical Churches of Europe, which we Americans shall always gratefully

revere and love as our mother. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you and with all the children of God.

P. S.

Mercersburg, August 10, 1857.

ART. II.—HISTORICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

Grammar, if it would do justice to its object, must be historical as well as rational. Historical grammar investigates the origin of words, of their inflexions and derivations, and of their constructions. Historical grammar, also, shows the alterations which the material and the rules of a given language have undergone in the course of time. To fulfil this task, it compares the cognate languages, because these, in a number of cases, have preserved the original forms, and because they furnish analogies illustrating the gradual alterations of those forms.

Rational grammar arranges the material in a logical order.

The English language is a compound chiefly of Saxon, Latin and Welsh words and derivations. A historical grammar of the English language will examine each of its constituent parts.

1. An examination of the Welsh element will not be given here.

2. The Latin element has either been borrowed immediately from the Latin, or it has passed through the lips of the French. For the latter part, the other daughters of Latin, as Italian and Spanish, may be compared to advantage.

3. The Saxon element may be compared first with the

other Germanic languages, especially on the one hand with the Gothic, which is more ancient, on the other hand with the German, which is more modern.

Secondly, the Saxon element, together with the other Germanic languages, forms a branch of the Indo-germanic family of languages, and may be compared with the other branches of that family, especially Latin, Greek and Sanscrit.

The following pages will not fulfil the whole task, but are merely presented as outlines. Their author is well aware of their many imperfections, and he would have refrained from publishing this essay, unless he cherished a hope, that, however defective in itself, it may serve as a preparative labor, and admonish grammarians to make the historic element enter more largely and accurately into their works than has hitherto been the case, whereby many peculiarities and seeming irregularities of the language would be accounted for more easily and naturally.

I. LATIN WORDS THAT HAVE PASSED INTO THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AS ALTERED BY THE FRENCH.

The Latin language degenerated in the mouth of the vulgar of the subject nations, and became the so called *lingua rustica*. The French language is a product of this *lingua rustica* and of a German element introduced by the Franks. There remain in it only a few traces of the Latin declensions. Nouns of the third declension have been retained, in the most part, in the form of the ablative singular. The vowels and the consonants have undergone many alterations, of which the most important are the following:

Liquid Consonants.

l inserted: turba—trouble.

l has become u, which is lost in English: pulsare—pousser—push; salvare—sauver—save.

l—r: scandalum—slander.

m—b: kamilos—cable.

m—u: nomen—noun.

n—r: kophinos—coffer; ordine—order.

n omitted in the termination: ensis—ese; pagina—page; mensura—measure; prensione—prison; conveniente—covenant.

r inserted: thesaurus—treasure.

r—l: paraveredus—palfrey; peregrinus—pilgrim.

r omitted: chirurgus—surgeon; persica—peach.

s omitted: cerasus—cherry; pisum—pea.

s prefixed: umbra—sombre; ansa—seize (spanish: asir).

Mute Consonants.

p—v: cooperire—cover; decipere—deceive.

p omitted: conceptus—conceit; deipnon—dine; pauper—poor.

b—v: febris—fever; gubernare—govern.

b assimilated: subitaneus—sudden.

bi—g: cambire—change; rabies—rage.

b inserted: camera—chamber; numerus—number; memorare—remember; similis—resemble (Greek: mesembria).

v—f: navis—nef; salvus—safe (prove: proof).

v omitted: civitas—city (curfew—kerchief).

vi, ve—g: abbreviare—abridge; cavea—cage; deluvium—deluge.

c—ch in the beginning of words: cantare—chant; caput—chief; kiste—chest.

c—g in the middle: draco—dragon.

c—i: fractus—fruit.

ce—s: placeo—please.

c omitted: inimicus—enemy; gratificari—gratify; periculum—peril; securus—sure; tractare—treat.

g—j: gaudium—joy.

g assimilated: flagitare—flatter.

g omitted: flagellum—flail; fragilis—frail; frigere—fry; legalis—loyal; regalis—royal; sigillum—seal.

t omitted: gratus—agree; catena—chain; decretum—decree; moneta—money; nutrice—nurse.

te, ti—c, s: lectio—lesson; platea—place; ratio—reason sententia—sentence.

tio—g: silvaticus—savage; viaticum—voyage.

d inserted : genere—gender (Greek : andros).
 d omitted : crudelis—cruel ; consuetudinem—custom ;
 desiderium—desire ; obedire—obey ; praeda—prey ; re-
 demptionem—ransom ; videre, participle Italian veduto,
 French vu, view ; cadentia—chance.

di—j : diurnus—journal.

dic—g, ch : vindicare—revenge ; praedicare—preach.

z—g : zingiber—ginger.

Vowels.

a—y : trinitas—trinity.

a—ai : clamare—claim ; remanere—remain.

a—ea : clarus—clear ; pace—peace.

e—i : pretium—price.

e—ea : revelare—reveal.

e—g before another vowel : extraneus—strange.

e omitted : eremita—ermit.

e prefixed : stabilire—establish.

i—a : mirabile—marvel ; bilance—balance.

i—e : missa—mess ; ingenium—engine ; initium—com-
 mence.

i—ei : dignari—deign.

i—ea : pirum—pear.

i passes into the foregoing syllable : oleum—oil ; spoli-
 um—spoil ; potio—poison.

o—oi : chorus—choir.

u—o : cupidus—covet.

u—oi : jungere—join.

u omitted : angulus—angle ; obstaculum—obstacle ; sta-
 bulum—stable.

Diphthongs.

ae—e : aemulari—emulate.

au—o, oo : aurantium—orange ; Maurus—Moor.

oe—e, ai : oeconomia—economy ; poena—pain.

NOTE.—In French, the w in the beginning of Germanic words, has been changed into g, as : Walter—Gautier ; warn—garnir ; wasp—guêpe ; wicket—guichet ; and e has been prefixed to s followed by a consonant, and s afterwards dropped. A few of these words have been received into the English language, wherein they already existed in their Saxon form, so that they now exist in a double form, in the original and in the French one. Such words are : shy, shun, eschew ; gain—win ; gard—ward ; guaranty—warrant ; guile—wile ; guise—wise.

II. WORDS BORROWED IMMEDIATELY FROM LATIN AND GREEK.

In such words there are comparatively few alterations, and these occur mostly in the terminations.

Verbs have been transferred either in the present indicative, as: *turbo*—disturb; *examino*—examine; *praetendo*—pretend, or in the past participle, as: *agitatus*—agitate; *depositus*—deposit; *unitus*—unite; or in the infinitive: *dominari*—domineer.

Consonants.

t—th: *auctor*—author.

d added: *sonus*—sound.

c omitted: *benefactum*—benefit.

g omitted: *regula*—rule.

pt—ch: *captare*—catch.

sc—sh: *scrinium*—shrine.

Vowels.

a omitted: *monachus*—monk; *poeta*—poet; *anatomia*—anatomy.

is omitted: *classis*—class.

us omitted: *camelus*—camel; *passus*—pace.

um omitted: *factum*—fact.

e—ee: *splen*—spleen.

o—oo: *bonum*—boon; *schola*—school.

o—ou: *contra*—encounter; *corona*—crown; *flore*—flower; *fonte*—fountain; *hora*—hour; *monte*—mount.

u—ou: *abundo*—abound.

o—ou: *callosus*—callous.

u—ou: *fortuitus*—fortuitous; *tremendus*—tremendous.

NOTE.—1. Many of the words latest introduced by the learned, have undergone no change, as *appendix*, *criterion*, *ratio*, *stimulus*, *stratum*.

2. A few Latin words exist in a double form, in their French form, and in a less altered one, as: *pauper*—poor, *pauper*; *probare*—prove, *probe*; *securus*—sure, *secure*.

III. A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH WORDS WITH THEIR CORRESPONDING LATIN AND GREEK ONES.

The words next to be examined are not borrowed from the Latin and Greek languages, but are to be considered as a common property of the Indo-germanic family, although they differ to some extent in their letters.

Liquid Consonants are generally the same on both sides, as: velle—will; molere—mill; nasus—nose; sus—sow; yet variations are not entirely wanting, thus;

m—w: madere—wet; meta—with.

s—r: aes—ore.

r—s: corylus—hazle.

The *mute Consonants* are found interchanged in a consistent manner, thus:

1. The *tenuēs* p, k or c, t have taken the place of the *mediae* b, g, d or z: cannabis—hemp; labium—lip; sanscrit gô—cow; gnonai—know; megale—mickle; sugere—suck; gyne—queen; ad—at; duo—two; edere—eat; decem—ten; domare—tame; meldomai—melt; drys—tree.

Exceptions: grandis—great; graphein—grave.

2. The *mediae* b, g, or y, d, have taken the place of the *aspiratae* ph, ch, th: ferre—bear; ferus—bear; phonos—bane; forare—bore; hesternus—yesterday; tharrein—dare; ther—deer; thyra—door; spathe—spade.

3. The *aspiratae* f, or v, h, or gh, th, have taken the place of the *tenuēs* p, k or c, t; leipein—leave; pater—father; petomai—feather; pyr—fire; piscis—fish; polos—foal; pus, podos—foot; kardia—heart; koptein—hew; kome—home; cornu—horn; case—house; curro—hurry; keutheîn

NOTE.—1. In some cases the consonants are transposed, as: bathys—deep; claudus—halt; granum—corn; plenus—full; pro—fore; philein—love; phyllon—leaf.

2. In other cases a consonant is added on one side, as: candeo—hot; chandanein—get; findere—bite; frangere—break; lingere—lick; pompe—five; septem—seven; psamathos—sand. Contrary: ballein—pelt; canis—hound; cervus—hart; keirein—shear; meldian—smile; mordeo—smart; moereo—mourn; nix—snow; homo—groom; hiare—yawn; olsya—osier; luceo—light; phlegein—bright; sal—salt; spuere—spit, stare—stand; taurus—steer; torcin—thorn; thanein—die; genus—kind.

3. The relation of words is sometimes obscured by changes of consonants on one side. Thus

h in the beginning of English words has disappeared before a consonant: circus—(hring) ring; corvus—(hraven) raven; klinein—(hlean) lean.

h omitted in the middle or end of words: dakry—tear; paucus—few; in-spicere—spy.

k changed into ch: gena—chin; phegos—beech.

n omitted before s, th: sanscrit hansa—chen—anser goose; dente—tooth.

w in Greek words changed into hy, in Latin words u into w, and the following vowel omitted: hydor—water; hyphainein—weave, sudare—sweat.

k, c, g, instead of p: piayres, tessares—quatuor—four; hepar—jecur—liver; sanscrit vrika—Greek lykos—sabine hirpus—Latin lupus—wolf.

—hide; quid—what; quum—when; collis—hill; tum—then; tenuis—thin; tres—three; to—the.

Exceptions. sp, st, ng, x and t after c, have remained unchanged: sparus—spear; stronny—strow; longus—long; sex—six; nocte—night; octo—eight; rectus—right; thygater—daughter. Likewise: calvus—callow; cura—care. d stands in the place of th: cutis—hide; hortus—garden; mente—mind; skotos—shade; traho—drag.

Vowels.

Original a preserved in English or changed into e, while in Greek or Latin it is changed into o: chole—gall; volvo—wallow; follis—bellows; hostis—guest; contrary: frater—brother; mater—mother; mene—moon. Original u preserved in English, weakened in Latin: centum—hundred. Contrary: jugum—yoke.

Some changes correspond to the change of the vowels in conjugation; on one side is i, the vowel of the present tense; on the other side is a or u, the vowel of the past tense: vigeo—wake; mulgeo—milk: rhiza—root.

In a few cases the Greek language has prefixed a vowel: agathos—good; aster—star; erythros—red; omphalos—navel; ophrys—brow; orophe—roof; alopex—fox.

Diphthongs.

Latin ae, English oa; haedus—goat. Latin au, English ea: auris—ear.

IV. A COMPARISON OF ENGLISH WORDS WITH THEIR CORRESPONDING GOTHIC AND GERMAN ONES.

Liquid Consonants.

m—n: besom—besen; bosom—busen; bottom—boden.
s—r: freeze—frieren; lose—verlieren (Verlust); soot—rusz; was—war. Contrary: hare—hase; iron—eisen. Gothic s—English and German r: basi—berry—beere; vësun—were—waren.

Mute Consonants.

In ancient high German the mute consonants of the Gothic and Saxon have been interchanged in the same man-

ner, as Gothic and Saxon have interchanged those of Greek and Latin.

1. The *tenuēs* p, k, t have taken the place of the *mediae* b, g, d. In modern German, however, the *mediae* b, g, have been restored; likewise d after l, n; good—gut; (ancient German *kuat*) grave—grab (ancient German *krap*); mild—mild; wind—wind.

2. The *mediae* b, g, d have taken the place of the *aspiratae* f, h, or gh, th. In the beginning of words, however, the German has retained h and has put the soft aspirate v instead of b, and in many words f is spelt for v. Likewise h is retained before t; full—voll; deaf—taub; horn—horn; thank—dank; the—der; thine—dein; north—nord; far—fern; right—recht; enough—genug.

3. The *aspiratae* f, or pf, ch, sz or z, have taken the place of the *tenuēs* p, k, t. In the beginning of words and elsewhere, however, the modern German has restored the *tenuis* k, and s or ss is often spelt for sz: deep—tief; sheep—schaf; sleep—schlaf; pan—pfanne; break—brechen; water—waszer; that—das, dasz; tin—zinn; tear—zerren; lot—loos; fox—fuchs; six—sechs; wax—wachs.

Exception. sp, st, t after gh, tr have remained unchanged: spring—springen; stun—staunen; flight—flucht; aspe—espe; west—west; true—treu.

Gothic and Saxon Consonants changed in English.

1. Transposition: brinnan—burn.
2. Omission of n before d, th: anthar—other; sunth—sooth; tunthu—tooth.
3. n—l: kind—child; kuntha—could.
4. Omission of v in the middle and end of words: saihvan—see (saw); saiv—sea; singvan—sing; sinkvan—sink.
5. b, v, f: thiub—thief, thievish.
6. sk, sh: skeinan—shine; skoh—shoe (scathan—scath).
7. k, ch: feccan—fetch; lêki—leech; vakan—watch; vrak—wretch; tekjan—touch. l in this connexion has been lost; mikil—much; hweleik—which.
8. h omitted before l in the beginning of words; hlaibs—loaf.

9. g, dg: brygge—bridge; egge—edge; flegge—fledge; hegge—hedge; wegge—wedge.

10. g, i, y; bergan—bury, bugjan—buy; eage—eye; dag—day; hagd—hail; fagd—fair; rign—rain; sagan—say; sigl—sail.

11. g, w: maurgin—morrow; saurga—sorrow; fugl—fowl.

12. h, y; slahan—slay.

13. h, w: swilhan—swallow; marh—marrow.

14. j, w: majan—mow; sajan—sow.

15. th, d: gulth—gold; nêthla—needle.

Gothic and English Consonants changed in German.

1. Addition: aiskan—ask—heischen; adder—otter, natter; hup—hip—hüfte; ais—ore—erz; melt—schmelzen; mēna—moon—mond; shut—schlieszen; speak—sprechen.

2. Omission: irksome—ekel; slink—schleichen; sneeze—niesen; sting—stechen.

3. Transposition: hoarse—heiser; horse—ross.

4. b dropped after m: climb—klimmen; crumb—krume; lamb—lamm; thumb—daum.

5. w dropped before r and in the end of words: wreak—rächen; hollow—hohl; shadow—schatte.

6. w, b: fallow—falb; swallow—schwalbe; yellow—gelb.

7. s, sch before l, m, n, w: slime—schlamm; smear—schmieren; snout—schnauze; swim—schwimmen.

8. h omitted before w: white—weisz.

Short Vowels.

1. Gothic a has in English and German been retained or changed into o: manna, man, mann; ana, on, an; af, of, ab; fram, from; kald, cold, kalt; skal, shall, soll; comb, kamm; (mat, meat; and, und).

2. Gothic e, spelt ai, corresponds to English e, ea, German e: airtha, earth, erde; hairda, herd, herde; hairto, heart, herz; (vaila, well, wol).

3. Gothic i has been retained or changed into e, ea, ie: blind, blind, blind; spinnan, spin, spinnen; hilpan, help, helfen; liban, live, leben; field, feld; brikan, break, brechen; learn, lernen; stilan, steal, stehlen.

4. Gothic *o*, spelt *au*, has been retained: *daur*, door, *thor*; *kaurn*, corn, *korn*.

5. Gothic *u* has been retained or changed into *o*, *oa*, *ou*: *fula*, foal, *fohlen*; *juk*, yoke, *joch*; *mulda*, mould; *sunna*, sun, *sonne*; *sunu*, son, *sohn*; *ufta*, often, *oft*; *tungo*, tongue, *zunge*; *summer*, *sommer*.

In many cases *u* has been changed into the diphthong *ou*, *au*: *nu*, now, *nun*; *thu*, thou, *du*; *skura*, shower, *schauer*; *round*, *rund*.

Long Vowels.

1. Gothic *ee* has been preserved in English, although often spelt *ea*; the German has *a*: *jer*, year, *jahr*; *letan*, let, *laszen*; *slep*, sleep, *schlaf*; *steel*, *stahl*; *read*, *rathen*; *vepn*, weapon, *waffe*; *quen*, queen; (*hair*, *haar*; *hook*, *haken*; *mena*, moon).

2. Gothic *oo* has been preserved in English, the German has *u*: *blôth*, blood, *blut*; *fôtu*, foot, *fusz*.

Diphthongs.

1. Gothic *ai* corresponds to English *a*, mostly *o*, *oa*, sometimes *ea*, German *ei*, *e*: *ain*, *an*; *one*, *ein*; *aith*, oath, *eid*; *dail*, deal, *theil*; *hailjan*, heal, *heilen*; *haithi*, heath, *heide*; *laisja*, lore, *lehre*; *saiv*, sea, *see*; *stain*, stone, *stein*; *vai*, woe, *wehe*; *haim*, ham, *heim*; *bleak*, *bleich*; *mean*, *meinen*; *sheath*, *scheide*; *weak*, *weich*; *wheat*, *weizen*; (*flesh*, *fleisch*).

2. Gothic *au* corresponds to English *ea*, German *au*, *o*: *auzo*, ear, *ohr*; *laub*, leaf, *laub*; (*raud*, red, *roth*; *hauh*, high, *hoch*; *lye*, *lauge*); *bread*, *brot*; *great*, *grosz*.

3. Gothic *ei* corresponds to English *i*, German *ei*, (anciently *i* long): *beitan*, bite, *beiszen*; *mein*, mine, *mein*: (*leitil*, little, *lûzel*).

4. Gothic *iu* corresponds to English *ea*, *ee*, *ie*, Saxon *eo*, German *ie*, *eu* (anciently *iu*): *duip*, deep, *tief*; *kniu*, knee,

NOTE.—In English and German *i* occurring in the termination often modifies the vowel of the preceding syllable, and this modification may remain, although the *i* which caused it is lost. Thus: *bride*, corresponds to the Gothic *bruth* and German *braut*, the *i* is a modification of *u* or *ou*. Again: *green*, *grün* have a modified *oo*, *u*; *seek* corresponds to the Gothic *sökjan*, German *suchen*.

knie; (siuk, sick, siech); stiur, steer, stier; thiub, thief, dieb: steer, steuern; (niun, nine, neun).

V. DECLENSION.

The number of objects and the relations which they sustain to each other, are expressed in the languages of the Indo-germanic family by peculiar terminations annexed to the root of the word, partly also by changing the vowel of the root.

Where these terminations are either lost in the course of time, or insufficient in themselves, prepositions must be resorted to.

The Sanscrit abounds in terminations; the Greek, Latin, Gothic, Saxon have a limited number; the English has retained a few.

1. *s* forms the genitive case and serves also to derive adverbs: else from an obsolete root *eli*, *alius*; needs; unawares. Sometimes *t* is annexed: amidst, amongst, whilst. The German shows some similar adverbial genitives: *flugs*, rings, stracks, unversehens.

2. *s* forms the plural number.

3. Plurals formed by a modification of the vowel: men, feet, geese, teeth, lice, mice.

4. Plurals formed by *n*: brethren, oxen, kine.

5. *m*, *n* belong to the dative plural: children, used as a nominative; whilom, has become an adverb.

6. Remains of the declension of numerals: the adverbial genitives once, twice, thrice, (*einst* for *eins*; *zwier*); the old accusative *twain*.

7. The Gothic demonstrative pronoun has furnished the English language with forms for its definite article, for its demonstrative pronouns, and for the personal pronoun, third person, plural:

the corresponds to *tho*, accusative, feminine singular.

this, these to *this*, *thise*, genitives masculine.

that to *thata*, nominative, singular, neuter.

those to *thos*, nominative, plural, feminine.

they, them, to *thai*, *thaim*, nominative and dative, plural, masculine.

the, used before comparatives is an old ablative:
the greater, eo major, tosoyto kreitton. Hebrews 1: 4.

VI. CONJUGATION.

The times and the persons to which actions are referred, as well as the modalities of actions, are expressed in the Indo-germanic languages by peculiar terminations annexed to the root of the verb, partly also by changing the vowel of the root.

Where these terminations are either lost in the course of time, or insufficient in themselves, there auxiliaries must be resorted to.

The Gothic forms the preterit tense in four different ways:

1. Either by a reduplication similar to that of the Greek perfect tense: slepa, saislep.

2. Or by reduplication and change of the vowel: lêta, lailôt.

3. Or by change of the vowel: brika, brak.

4. Or by the termination *da*: sôkja, sôkida.

The verbs of the first, second and third classes have no termination in the first and third persons singular indicative of the preterit tense; the second person annexes *t*, and the past participle *an*.

The past participle of the verbs of the fourth class ends in *ith*.

The verbs of the English language may, as to their conjugation, be divided into three classes.

1. Such as form the preterit tense by a change of the vowel.

2. Such as form it by annexing *ed*.

3. Such as employ both methods.

Each of these three classes presents anomalies; but it is unhistorical to call all verbs of the first class irregular; the change of the vowel is as good and justified a method of forming tenses as the annexation of a syllable; it is even more lively and expressive. Perhaps the first class would present less anomalies, if these verbs had not

been, by grammarians, considered a nuisance and, consequently, neglected. We consider them rather a beauty of the language.

First Class.

1. Present *i*; Preterit Singular *a*, Plural *u*; Past Participle *u*: begin, cling, come, (Gothic *quiman*), dig, drink, fling, ring, run, sing, sink, shrink, sling, slink, spin, spring, stick, sting, stink, string, swim, swing, win, wring.

2. *e*, *ea*—*a*, *o*—*o*;

bear, break, choose, climb, cleave, freeze, get, heave, help, melt, seethe, shear, speak, steal, swear, swell, tear, tread, wear, weave, forlorn, (Greek: *trepo*, *etrapon*, *tetropha*).

3. *i*, *ea*, *ee*—*a*—*i*, *ea*, *ee*.

bid, beat, eat, give, lie, see, sit, spit; *quoth* is the preterit tense of the obsolete verb *quithan*.

4. *i*—Preterit Singular *o*, Plural *i*,—*i*.

abide, betide, bite, chide, drive, hide, ride, rive, shine, shrive, slide, smite, stride, strike, strive, thrive, write, writhe.

5. *ow*—*ew*—*ow*.

blow, crow, draw, fly, grow, know, show, strow, throw.

6. *a*—*oo*—*a*.

forsake, hang, shake, slay, stand, take, wake.

7. *a*—*e*—*a*.

fall, hold.

8. *i*—*ou*.

bind, find, grind, wind, fight.

Second Class.

Here we notice the following anomalies:

1. Verbs in *t*, *d*, adding no termination in the preterit, but shortening the vowel if long:

bleed, breed, burst, cast, cost, cut, feed, hit, hurt, knit, lead, let, lift, light, meet, put, quit, read, rid, set, shed, shoot, shred, shut, slit, speed, split, spread, sweat, thrust.

2. Verbs in *d*, making *t* of *ded*:

bend, blend, build, gild, gird, lend, rend, send, spend.

3. Verbs adding *d* or *t*, shortening the vowel if long :
burn, cleave, creep, dare, deal, dip, dream, dwell, feel,
flee, hear, keep, kneel, lean, leap, leave, lose, mean, reap,
reave, say, shoe, sleep, slip, smell, spell, spill, strip, sweep,
weep ; wont is the past participle of the obsolete verb *wonan*.

4. Verbs omitting their last consonant before *d* :
clothe, have, make.

5. Verbs forming their past participle by *en* :
bake, fold, grave, hew, lade, mow, prove, saw, shave,
show, sow.

Third Class.

1. Present *e*, the modification of *a*, Preterit *o*, anciently *a*, the restoration of *a* : sell, tell, (ancient German : *zellen*, *zalte*).

2. bring, buy, catch, do, freight, owe, reach, seek, teach, think, work.

3. can, shall, may, must, will, wot, are preterit tenses of obsolete present tenses, for which reason a few of them add *t* in the second person singular, they all do not add *s* in the third person singular, they have no infinitive, and some of them have no participle. They are now used as present tenses (compare in Latin : *coepi*, *memini*, *novi*, *odi*) and form new preterit tenses.

Defective Verbs.

1. go borrows its preterit tense from *wend*, (Italian *andare*).

2. be (Greek : *phyo* ; Latin : *fui*) borrows its present indicative from the root *as*, *ar*, (Sanskrit *as*, Greek *esmi*, Latin *esse*).

First person *am* instead of *arm*, the *m* being an obsolete termination. The preterit tense is borrowed from the obsolete verb : *visan* : was, wast, were.

We believe that, by an arrangement like the one given here, the learner may better be introduced into the English conjugation, than by a list wherein all these verbs are thrown together, although we do not deny the expediency of such a list for reference.

Terminations.

1. Present tense, second person singular annexes *s* in Gothic, as in Greek and Latin, the *t* is an appendix of later date.

2. Third person singular, in Gothic and ancient English, annexes *th*, corresponding to Latin *t*.

3. Infinitive, in Gothic and Saxon, ends in *an*. The *n* seems to have been dropped through the influence of the Danish language, where the infinitive has simply *e*.

4. Present Participle, in Gothic and Saxon, ends in *and*. This *nd* remains in the following participles, now used as substantives: fiend, from Gothic *fijan*—to hate; friend, from Gothic *frijon*—to love. For *nd* the derivative termination *ing* has been substituted.

Auxiliaries.

The Goths used their present tense for a present and a future, and their preterit tense for an imperfect, a perfect and a pluperfect.

The English and German languages employ *be* and *have*, *sein*, *haben* for the perfect and the pluperfect. For the future the English has *shall*, *will*, which are found also in ancient German, whilst modern German has *werden*.

The Goths, although forming a passive gender, yet sometimes used as an auxiliary verb *visan*: *daupidai vesun*—were dipped (baptized); or *vairthan*, as in German *werden*: *atgibans varth*—was given—*gegeben ward*.

VII. DERIVATION.

1. A few substantives are derived from verbs merely by a change of the vowel or last consonant, or not even that:

band, bit, drove, song, stand, strife, stroke, web, writ, wrong.

Compare in Latin: *tegere*, *toga*; in Greek: *trepein*, *tropos*; *speydein*, *spoyde*; *leipein*, *loipos*; *ptêssein*, *ptôchos*; in German: *binden*, *binde*, *band*, *bund*.

2. Such changes occur even when terminations are annexed. *Substantives* are formed by adding

le : handle, shuttle, spittle, towel, (Gothic *thvahan*--to wash), girdle, (Greek : *didaskalos*).

m : bloom, doom, film, (Greek : *poiema*, *odyrmos*).

r : layer, bower, from the obsolete *bauan*.

s : loss, (Greek : *doxa*).

t : from verbs : behest (from the obsolete *behaetan*), bequest, draught, flight, frost, grist, might, sight, theft, weight.

t : from nouns : drought, hight, theft.

th : from verbs : birth, growth, stealth.

th : from nouns : breadth, dearth, length, month, width, youth. (Greek : *kopetos*).

d : flood, ford, seed.

e : pride.

er, or : from the root *as*, *ar* : lawyer, sailor.

et : circlet.

in : ermin, from the obsolete *harm*.

ness ; Gothic *assus*, from the root *as* : goodness.

ter : garter, halter, laughter, shelter, slaughter.

ster : originally feminines : songster, spinster, webster.

ing : forms personal nouns : king, Saxon *kuning*, from *kuni*--race, family ; but mostly abstract nouns like the German *ung*.

ock : hillock.

kin : lambkin.

let : ringlet.

lin : ermelin.

ling : suckling.

} Compound terminations.

Adjectives are formed by adding

y, Gothic *ag*, *eig*, (Greek : *ikos*), lofty, rainy.

le : brittle.

ish : childish, french, welsh.

en : (Greek ; *inos*) : brazen, heathen, wollen.

er : forms simple adjectives : bitter (German : *wacker*) ; but mostly comparatives : smaller.

In Gothic, comparatives are formed by adding *isa*, and this *s* has remained in the comparatives : less, worse, from the obsolete verb *wirran*--to trouble.

est: forms superlatives: first.

In Gothic, superlatives are formed from adverbs by adding *uma*: *innuma*; the Saxon has added to these comparatives a second termination: *innunist*, *innumost*, from whence come such words as *inmost*, which look as if they were compositions of *most*. (Compare Latin *imus*; *intimus*).

th: forms ordinals: fourth (Latin *tus*: *quartus*).

Adverbs.

Correlatives: here, hither, hence.

th: forth.

Verbs are formed in Gothic by adding *jan*; of this termination, in some cases *e* has been retained; *bathe*, *breathe*, *glaze*.

In other cases the vowel is changed or modified:

fell, fill, gild, grope.

In cases without number the verb does not differ from its primitive word.

l: kneel, grapple, ramble, settle, speckle, startle, throttle.

n: deepen, frighten, lengthen, widen, (Greek: *aino*, *leykaino*.)

k: talk from tell; walk from *wallôn* French, *aller*.

r: clamber, flitter, wander, waver, (Greek *eiro*: *oikteiro*) (hear, Gothic *hausjan*, seems to be derived from ear, *ausjo*, by prefixing *h*, which is causative, as *h* in the Hebrew conjugation *hifil*).

3. The variety of compositions may be arranged under the following heads:

Substantive and Substantive: goldpen, namesake, tradesman, gospel, (from god and spill—a narrative), nightingale, (from night and the obsolete verb *galan*—to sing), world, (from *vair*—Latin *vir* and *ald*—generation). Alfred, (from *Alf*—elf and *raed*—counsel). Os-good, (from *ans*, *as*, *os*—

NOTE.—Latin and Greek derivative terminations are often added to English roots: able: readable.

ee (Latin: *atus*): settee, trustee.

eous: righteous.

ess: (issa): shepherdess.

ism: witticism.

ment: settlement.

god). The words in ard, dom, head, hood, rick, are compositions, as these are not derivative syllables, but independent words: ard—hard; dom—doom, head, hood—essence, rick—empire.

Adjective and Substantive: highway, holiday, blackamoor. The words in ship are also compositions, as ship is originally an independent word, connected with shape.

Adverb and Substantive: nought, (from ni and wiht—thing); not is an abbreviation of nought, as the Greeks use oyden for oy, the Latins nihil for non.

Preposition and Substantive: arvasna (from hvas—sharp)—arrow; foreman; inroad; overcoat; outlet; underwood; upland.

Substantive and Adjective: wayfaring. The words in ful, less, ly, some are compositions, as these are also independent words: by—like; less—loose, German los.

Adverb and Adjective: unkind, (un a negation, Greek an, Latin in, used only in composition), neither (from the obsolete negation ni).

Substantive and Verb: partake, waylay.

Adjective and Verb: curtail.

Adverb and Verb: mistake, (Gothic misso—athwart), outbid, uphold.

Preposition and Verb: arise, (a seems to be an abbreviation either of on, Gothic ana, or of at; it is used independently in constructions like the following: the ark was a preparing, (1 Pet. 3: 20).

become (be an older form of by).

embody, endear (en—in).

forbid (for—Gothic fra).

foretell (fore—Gothic faura).

gainsay.

overtake.

untie, (un—Gothic and German ent).

understand.

withstand (with—Gothic vithra).

yelad (y—Gothic ga, German ge, which are prefixed to the past participle of verbs and correspond to the Latin preposition cum).

answer (a composition of the Danish verb svare, and the preposition an or and).

Adverb and Preposition : herein, thereof, upon.

Adverb and Adverb : never, (ni, ever).

Preposition and Preposition : against, before, behind, into, within.

Preposition and Adverb : but, (be—out), throughout, about, (an, be, out), above, (an, be, ove).

Adjective and Conjunction : although.

Adverb and Conjunction : nor, (ni, or).

NOTE—English roots are often composed with Latin adverbs or prepositions : counterwork, disown, interweave, recall, perhaps.

VIII. SYNTAX.

In treating this department of grammar we would proceed in the following order :

1. *Elements of the Sentence.*

Persons or objects are denoted by substantives or personal pronouns. They are more accurately described by adding to the substantive or pronoun either articles, adjectives, appositions, which are cöordinate, or genitives and prepositions with their cases, which are subordinate.

Actions are expressed by verbs, and here the use of the different genders, moods and tenses must be shown. Verbs have their complement in adverbs and in substantives, which they govern either immediately or by prepositions.

2. *Formation of the Sentence.*

Sentences may be undeveloped, consisting of a mere substantive or pronoun, such are titles, epitaphs, vocatives, or of a mere verb, such is the imperative mood.

The construction of a substantive and a verb gives the developed sentence, in which regard must be had to position and to concordance.

3. *Connexion of Sentences.*

Sentences are either cöordinate or subordinate to each other. Cöordinate sentences may be connected by conjunctions, or unconnected, asyndeta. Words common to two or more sentences may, in certain cases, be expressed but once.

Subordinate sentences may be connected by conjunctions or relative pronouns, which both are omitted in certain cases. Some subordinate sentences are abridged by putting the verb in the participle or in the infinitive.

IX. METRE.

1. A Latin or Greek verse is a regular succession of long and short syllables. Regard is had to the quantity, to the time necessary for pronouncing the different syllables. An English or German verse is a regular succession of accented or unaccented syllables. Regard is had to the quality, to the greater or less significancy of the different syllables. A Greek or Latin iambus consists of a long syllable, preceded by a short one; the latter may contain the root, the former be a mere termination, as in: *nea, trophe*. An English or German iambus consists of an accented syllable preceded by an unaccented one; both may be long, as: *unfold*. A trochee consists of an accented syllable preceding an unaccented one; the former may be short, the latter long, as: *living*. English verses are composed either of iambs or trochees. In some cases two unaccented syllables are allowed, instead of one, which gives anapaests and dactyles, as:

With reverence heed their parents' word.—*Hymn*.

Where three unaccented syllables concur, the middle of them receives a slight accent, as:

Unspeakable, who sittst above these heavens,
To us invisible, or dimly seen.—*Milton*.

Likewise the latter of two unaccented syllables at the end of a verse:

A fortnight hold we this solemnity.—*Shakespeare*.

In the beginning of iambic verses trochees are admitted sometimes:

Fairest of stars, lost in the train of night.—*Milton*.

2. But this regularity in the succession of accented and unaccented syllables, has not been deemed sufficient by the Germanic nations, to distinguish poetry from prose. They connect their verses by a concordance in sound. In ancient times the consonants beginning the most important syllables of two succeeding verses were the same. This

concordance of consonants is called alliteration, *stabreim*, which is found, also, in a number of proverbial locutions, as : bend or break, fish or flesh, grave and gay, heart and hand, last but not least, might and main, like priest like people, safe and sound, saint and sinner, sire and son, aship and ashore, stout and strong, toil and trouble, weal and woe;—*bausch und bogen, geld und gut, haus und hof, gang und gáb, land und leute, lieb und leid, mann und maus, nacht und nebel, null und nichtig, schiff und geschirr, stab und stecken, wehr und waffe, wind und wetter.* In Latin : *curae cordique esse, ferro flammaque vastare, hirtus atque horridus, maria montesque polliceri, sanus et siccus, succus ac sanguis.* In Greek : *stolos stratos te.* In Hebrew : *na 'va nad. G. 4 : 14., shamir va shayit. Isaia 7 : 23.*

3. Alliteration as an ornament in poetry was succeeded by the concordance of the last accented syllables of two or more verses, which is called rhyme. The rhyme too, occurs in proverbial locutions : *helterskelter, hurlyburly, talk and walk, tear and wear;—dach und fach, kern und stern; rat und tat; sang und klang; salz und schmalz; saus und braus; schutz und trutz; stein und bein; weg und steg:* In Greek : *rhome kai gnome; pheme kai mneme.* In Hebrew : *tohu va bohu. Gen. 1 : 2.*

Alliteration and rhyme were used by Greek and Roman poets to make single verses more expressive, but not to connect different verses. Examples :

hoisi Zeus poinima pathea pathein poroi.—Sophokles.
tois men stellein, toisi de mellein.—Euripides.
mollia luteola pingit vaccinia caltha.—Virgil.
tum cornix plena pluviam vocat improba voce,
et sola in sicca secum spatiaturn arena.—Virgil.

The use of rhyme as a connexion of verses was first introduced by the ancient Christian poets.

4. Epic, didactic, and dramatic poems suffer the constant repetition of the same verse in an equal flow, whilst in lyric poetry either equal or unequal verses are separated into groups of the same length, called stanzas. Usually the architecture of stanzas displays a law of symmetry; there are two equal parts corresponding to each other, each of which

may again consist of equal or unequal sections. To these two equal parts a third unequal part is often, by way of contrast, associated. Examples: Two equal parts, each of two unequal verses:

Lo! what a cloud of witnesses
Encompass us around!
Men, once, like us with sufferings tried,
But now with glory crowned. [Hymn.

Two equal parts, each of two equal verses:

As he surveys the much loved spot,
He slights the space that lies between.
His past fatigues are now forgot,
Because his journey's end is seen. [Hymn.

Two equal parts and a third:

Thanks we give and adoration
For the Gospel's joyful sound.
May the fruits of thy salvation
In our hearts and lives abound.
May thy presence
With us evermore be found. [Hymn.

Not so frequently three equal parts are associated with a fourth:

On Linden, when the sun was low,
All bloodless lay the untrodden snow,
And dark as winter was the flow
Of Isar, rolling rapidly. [Campbell.

The same symmetry may be discovered in the strophes invented by the Greek and Italian lyric poets. We find in the alcaic strophe, two equal verses succeeded by two unequal ones, as:

Justum ac tenacem propositi virum
Nec civium ardor, prava jubentium,
Nec vultus instantis tyranni
Mente quatit solida, neque Auster. [Horace.

Three equal verses, succeeded by one unequal, sapphic strophe, as:

Rectius vives, Licini, neque altum
Semper urgendo, neque, dum procellas
Cantus horreces, nimium premendo
Littus iniquum. [Horace.

Two equal parts succeeded by a third, which is again composed of two equal parts, in the Italian sonetto of 4, 4, 8, 8 verses.

In the choruses of the Greek drama, there is a strophe and an antistrophe, corresponding to the two equal parts of the stanza, whilst the epode corresponds to the third, unequal part of the stanza. The different parts of stanzas should be well proportioned: when a third part follows two equal parts, its extent should be scarcely less than one of the two equal parts, nor much greater than the sum of both.

The verses of the first part rhyme either with each other, or with the corresponding verses of the second part. The third part may have its own rhymes, or some of its verses may agree with verses of the two preceding parts.

In the poem of Campbell, above quoted, the fourth lines of all stanzas are linked together by rhyme. Elsewhere the same verse or verses are repeated in all stanzas.

X. ORTHOGRAPHY.

We conclude by stating, on the orthography of the English language, what we have to say from our stand-point.

It would, beyond doubt, be desirable to have one sign to each sound, and one sound to each sign, and no sign to no sound. This end might be reached by introducing a few marks on the letters now in use.

But all homonymes could then not be distinguished by their external appearance, and the origin of many words would be obscured.

The present system has this advantage, that in other languages we easily recognize the words adopted into English. Yet it is susceptible of improvements.

Let inconsistencies be removed, without altering materially the original spelling of words.

Examples.

hw instead of wh, as : hwat, Saxon hwat.

g, q without u, where no u is sounded, as: conqer, liqor, gard.

k, c instead of ch, in words like skeptik, arkives, carактер.

g instead of gh in the words gost, burg.

h instead of gh, where neither is sounded, as :

hih, Saxon heah ; riht.

dh instead of soft th, as ; dhine.

a instead of au in words like hant.

au instead of ou in words like fauht.

ie instead of ei in words like recieve.

o instead of oa, as oke, othe ; except where oa sounds like au, as : broad.

o instead of oo, ou in words like : dore, flore, mold, sholder.

oo instead of o, oe, in words like : doo, moove, canoo, shoo.

ou instead of ow, where a diphthong is sounded, as: brou, froun.

u instead of ou, in words like ; anxius, enough, luev, wunt.

CONCLUSION.

There are two ways of treating a language. The one is to establish rules founded partly on facts and partly on our imagination, and to call irregular whatever does not agree with those rules. The other way is to observe *all* the facts, tracing a historic development in its whole extent, not only taking up its extremities. The first (rationalistic) method has been followed already too long in English Grammar. It is high time to adopt the second (historical) method. You cannot properly understand or correctly judge the social or political condition of any nation without a knowledge of its history. Just so it is with language.

Grammar, treated historically, discloses the inmost spirit and character of a nation in its working upon language.

Historical grammar does justice to the national spirit, and is truly popular.

We hope the day is not distant, when the universities of this country will be furnished with a truly historical grammar of the English language, by a man acquainted with all the languages that have influenced the English.

A collection of extracts from the best productions of the Anglo-Saxon literature, with a short grammar and a glossary, is also a desideratum, to which we direct the attention of those of our learned men who visit England.

Sheboygan, Wis.

J. BOSSARD.

ART. III.—CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

IN the progress of our examination of the subject of Comparative Architecture, in a previous article, we arrived at the fact that, like all other nations, so the Christian nation, that is the Church, has expressed herself in a form of Art, which is probably the final form until the second coming of her Lord ; at least that the facts of the case since,—all attempts at something different having been, for *church-architecture*, without a single exception, mere vagaries and non-entities—show us imperatively that our only hope of attaining to any thing better, lies in our cordially readopting that which we have, already furnished to our hand. This Christian Architecture we found to be one, and catholic. To a far more unvarying degree and under an incomparably more forceful instance is cathedral architecture the sign of the Christian people, than the Doric temple of the Grecian, or the Corinthian of the Roman, people.

We thus found our subject bringing itself to bear upon the higher question of Church unity. If the progress of church architecture since the full cathedral took on its form does show that no improvement has been made, and that the thing remaining after all intervening trials, for any Christian congregation at this day to do, in order to build for themselves an adequate church edifice, is to revert to the elements of Cathedral Art ; then is not the inference legitimate that the proper thing for the same people to do in order to get visibly back to the Catholic Faith, is to revert to the palpable form of that Faith which lay at the foundation of the evolution of that Cathedral ? Let us not be misunderstood. We use the word Cathedral here, not at all in its technical sense, but as that which represents the Catholic Church. We admit that the building was de-

veloped under the pope and bishops, we acknowledge therein the hand of Providence, but we hold that the Architecture is that of the Catholic Church. In other words, as we have a very high idea of the Art, so have we a high idea of Catholic unity, an idea to which the earthly bishop is not necessary. The bishopric, in which we recognize a divine appointment to the same extent that we see a divine appointment in the king, but a diviner, so to speak, in the Government—the bishopric did its work, so long as it did the same, according to the will of Providence, and while that work remains the permanent gift of the Church, we think we can as clearly see in Providence that the office is not a necessary element in the idea of unity, or a necessary function as it respects its actualization and conservation. The true Head is in Heaven, the centre of an infinitely broader horizon than can be drawn from any point upon earth, and as it respects the earthly order of the Church in relation to her Head, the history of the Church, since the Reformation, does attest the power of the Church as the ground and pillar of the truth, to be at least as exemplary under the Presbyterian representative of the true Headship, as under the Prelatical.

Defenders of Episcopacy on the ground of its universally obligatory divine appointment, are in the habit of charging want of candor upon Presbyterian controversialists in not allowing due weight to the historical argument as drawn from the primitive Church. However this may be, no writers have shown a more manifest lack of candor than themselves, as seen in their method of dealing with historical arguments since. It only shows how true it is that the making of any, not expressly commanded, particular a necessary element of unity constrains the thoughts of a man into a specified channel out of which they cannot proceed, and which of course must limit both the views and feelings—must degrade unity and violate charity. It has been a favorite method of these writers to point to the defections of certain of the Presbyterian bodies on the Continent. Now

surely a candid search for truth might have found it nearer home. We find the tractarian writer, for example, on the other side of the Atlantic, making out his catena of testimonies in behalf of his doctrine, not merely of a standing or falling Church, but his very doctrine of the Church. He has most legitimately gone to the writings of those venerable men in whom, if at all, the doctrine is to be found, seeing they are, by the necessity of his theory, the divine representatives of it. He finds himself compelled to pass by the whole body of the bishops under which his Church was reformed, and by far the greater portion of them since, and the weightiest portion of them strongly protesting against his doctrine—and yet this writer is able to maintain that here and here only is that Church of God which is the bearer and witness of truth! That is to say, his doctrine of the Church is that of the divine indispensableness of the bishopric—the bishopric is the divine witness of the doctrine—and yet, of all the English bishops since the Reformation, certainly not more than one in fifty can be found who teach the doctrine which they were divinely constituted to teach! And then this very writer will point to France, Switzerland and Germany, and cry, “behold the fact,—in rejecting the bishop they denied the Church and are reaping the curse of schism in their heresies.” Now assuredly if this man possessed the candor, the want of which he charges on others, he would see two things;—one, that the English bishopric has not been a true witness to the doctrine on which the Church, as he maintains, is founded; and the other, that the Church of Scotland, which he would also see to be the only fair instance of a Church working under a Presbyterial centre of unity, has been, at least equally with his own, an uniform witness of the truth. She is not indeed a witness-bearer of *his* peculiar doctrine, nor has she certainly held forth the truth in *his* peculiar style; but if he were a candid man then must he have acknowledged that the Church of Scotland has for two centuries been a more unvarying witness to the truths which she

holds as essential, than the Church of England has been to the truth which *he* holds to be essential. If the one has had seceders, the other has had its Hoadleys—if the one has had a particular period of moderation, as to her own saving doctrines, the other has had a life of moderation as to *his* saving doctrine, even from the day of Cranmer to the present excellent bishops of his Church.

A like disordering of vision is seen in the case of those who, in our land, have been carried away with this theory. The venerable bishops of Ohio and Virginia are no witnesses for this truth, yet they are equally bishops with those of Maryland or of New Jersey. Now how a man can continue to hold fast to a theory which necessitates that the bishop shall witness of his doctrine, every where and always,—while the fact is not so, but is oftener the contrary, it is hard for candor to see. Certainly if the high-church theory mean any thing besides words, it means that where the bishop is, there one and the same teaching is—and yet, as a matter of fact, the whole cast of teaching, the form of religion and piety resulting under the teaching of some of the American bishops is as different from that which comes out from the training of others, as the religion of the intelligent Puritan is from that of the pious Romanist. But here again, as in the other case, the American high-churchman will point to the sects as the English churchman pointed to the Socianism of the Continent. And yet here too is a like fair illustration at hand. We are ourselves no believers in sects, we are strong believers in governments and powers, and we believe that the true Presbyterian bodies of America have the same. It is simply manifest to the senses that the teaching of these bodies is at least as uniform as to what they hold to be true doctrine, as that of the Prelatic body is, and rather more so. The high-churchman's theory is worth nothing, because it has never yet actualized itself, and least of all is it doing so now. The argument of succession as evidence of true teaching might have been a valid and most useful argu-

ment in its day—it might be so now, had it continued to carry its authentication in itself;—but to say, at this age of the Church, I, the bishop, am the true Church for you, inasmuch as I am the divinely constituted channel and witness of catholic truth, and then find one bishop saying this and another that as catholic truth,—why it is dealing with a man as if he were a child. Whatever the bishop might have been in this respect, in the early ages of the Church, and we believe he was in Providence much for the times,—yet in the light of actual facts as now existing, we cannot see how the argument can ever again be of much practical use. It is simply a fact that the bishops of the world at this day, are no more a catholic one in their teachings, than the presbyters of the world are. However as this doctrine seems to have come with a helping force here and there to certain troubled intellects, able to receive its help without feeling its defectiveness, we will no longer quarrel with it for such, or for those who find themselves bound in conscience to hold it. The great objection we have to make to it has respect to its effect in reducing the glorious conception of unity to the boundaries of a technical horizon, and so hindering the progress of true catholicity. As such we cannot see how it differs from any other definition of the mere understanding. It is just as much so on the churchman's part as that which he seems to find on the puritan's part in defining another class of doctrines. And, inasmuch as it is such, it must produce division to the same degree in which it is held to be essential. Whenever a technical definition is made the test of catholic unity it must operate to limit and divide the Church. We mean that no dictum of uninspired logic can be made an indispensable element in the idea of catholic unity without producing division. We honor the Church of England, we bless the Church of England, we heartily acknowledge and reverence her bishops as men chosen of God in their office to do a great work, nor would we have her constitution altered; but we should be sorry indeed to find ourselves

under the constraint of a theory which must deny the name of Church, that most glorious of all names under the saving Name, to all Christian people now living, who are not in communion with the pope, the patriarch, or the Church of England. The Church of England stands or falls with the other Churches of the Reformation. Our hope is in Him who can cause us all to stand, and who will cause us all to stand together some day. Only let us do what we can to get upon a ground of commutual understanding with each other. And it is for this reason that we must be permitted to make a further explanation. For ourselves we should be as sorry to believe that low-church religion is Episcopal religion, as that high-churchism is the true Episcopacy. We fear there are nearly as many Zwinglians in the low-church as there are in other denominations. As far as we have been able to see, the low-church style of the faith is equally unchurchly, unsacramental, with that which is to be found in other bodies; the same Arminian puritanism, or congregationalism, or whatever the thing be, has crept in and unchurched us all. It seems to us that our low-church Episcopal brethren have quite as much to do in order to get back to the true spirit of their Liturgy, as the high-church to get back to the true Episcopacy, or as the Presbyterian to get back to the full spirit of his confession. When that most blessed work and labor of love shall have been done by all, then we are assured it will appear how nigh we are together. May the good day make haste!

The Apostolic Church, which is the ground upon which we are to get together, assumed its accessible form for faith in the Apostles' Creed. Let us then all say the Creed. It is true that the Church of Rome, as well as portions of the Episcopal Church, make it mean too much, make the article of the Church to mean the pope, to involve the bishop, and others of the Reformed Churches do not, alas, say it at all, so that it has even become a strange sound to them and to their children. Still, as we do not believe that visible unity is to be altogether the result of a foregoing spir-

itual unity, but that the two are to proceed in virtue of a reciprocal working, even like as faith begets the sacrament and the sacrament begets faith, so do we believe that something is gained whenever the varying divisions of the Church fall upon the same usage, although each from its own point of view. Consent in the observation of the same Sabbath is assuredly something, and so would consent in the observation of the same fasts and festivals be an additional advantage. Consent in the regular use of the Lord's Prayer and of the Apostles' Creed would be a still farther advance. Let the Christian, such being the use in all Churches, go out on Sunday in order to find some assembly of saints, and whatever he might find, he would find something for himself, he would find a prayer and a creed, the mother-tongue of his own faith, and it would be his own fault if he did join in them.

But here now we feel instinctively that there can be little hope at this point, for we have struck upon a self-conscious process, and all the prejudices in which we have grown up are startled. There are Protestants to whom the altar service of the Roman churches is not idolatry, and who could thankfully say the Creed with those who there said it, but the number of such is very small; and as matters now are the Romanist and the high-churchman would almost seem to think of going into other places of worship. Let us see then if there are gleams of hope from the other quarter—the aesthetic, which is never a self-conscious process. What we have further to say on our subject will be, in reality, a somewhat prolonged examination of the question, Whether any light of hope is indicated by the fact that at this hour, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Episcopalians are, as it were, unconsciously and unsuspectingly building churches mainly in the elements of true Christian Architecture? If those churches, in their architecture, are, as we believe they are, the embodied echo, as it were, of the catholic faith, then will they not tend unconsciously to reproduce the catholic forms of faith, and so

tend to bring us back to unity? We hope so. We can not understand how a congregational church could continue to deny governments under the continued influence of cathedral art, or how the Puritan Christian could so continue to close his ears to the liturgical resoundings of the mystical body, or how the churchman or the catholic shall continue to see a visible head under the continued influence of that grand art whose glory is that its unity is never represented to the sense, but ever indicated to the spirit. This much at least have we, as a good sign of hope, that with several of the great Christian bodies of our land, while it would seem for the present a vain task to persuade them to reintroduce the Apostles' Creed, as an integral part of their church service, they can without difficulty go on to build their church edifices according to that form of Christian art which was the true product of the creed. What we mean by saying that the Gothic church is the place, and as yet, the only sufficient place in which to say the creed, will appear further on.

In the mean time let us recapitulate the argument. The architectural argument, we have said—and whoever has well considered the history of Solomon's temple, what it was to the former covenant, how it stood to our Lord's body, what it experienced at his death, will feel that the argument has a hopeful meaning—clearly indicates that the thing at hand for the great sections of the Church, patriarch, pope, and reformer, to do in order to strive together unto unity, is for each to go back to the true Christian temple, the Pointed Cathedral, and so labor to get back together to the Apostolic Church. Full well do we know that each claim already to have it, and as fully do we know that neither has. The one has too much, the other too little; we hope that all have it essentially, but we know that, whatever of it we may have at heart, we all need to have our speech more truly set to the Apostolic tone. We as little believe that the reformer talks altogether as the Church of the Apostles talked, as we do that the Romanist and high-church-

man possess the true language. To the extreme reformer that language, when speaking of the Church, the sacraments, the communion of saints, is actually by itself as strange as the sound of the Creed, while on the lips of the extreme churchman, it is repeated either with the painful emphasis of a new found phrase, or else bandied with a freedom that exhausts it of its awfulness, even as some Christian people can wear the cross about their neck as a trinket of this world.

Nevertheless it is not to be denied that Episcopal religion has the chief advantage here, its phraseology, the forms and utterances of its daily faith, are more like the speech of the Apostolic Church, than are to be found among other Christians. Just what we mean here is this: the Apostles, for example, sometimes addressed believers as the holy, the sanctified, sometimes as the baptized, and a slight examination of the Epistles shows that such was the customary usage in the Apostolic Church. They never taught that the baptized were necessarily the sanctified, but their method of speaking takes it for granted that their faith is strong enough to receive, without alarm, their description either from the one side or from the other. We find it to be a matter of fact that the truly spiritual Episcopal Christian is able to endure the same. To the Roman Catholic this kind of language would be nearly unintelligible, because the sign of his sanctification is to him the ever present papacy. The extreme reformer could not stand the language without constant protest and parenthesis. To take a more familiar instance. In the matter of saying grace at meat; the Roman Christian makes the sign of an invisible cross over the table. It is not Apostolic, it is overwrought. The Puritan makes a particular prayer to the occasion. This is very good, the primitive Christian could do the same, but he also could do something different which the Puritan cannot, which would astonish his faith when done, and would really have no meaning to him. That is to say, the early Christian could sometimes use the

Gloria Patri at meat. Episcopal religion can do the same, naturally, easily, and satisfactorily, and in so doing, acts in perfect accordance with the spirit and the letter of Apostolic speech. For ourselves, we cannot but feel, after a careful comparison of the Episcopal Liturgy with the Epistles of the New Testament, on this point, of the full phraseology of faith and piety, that as it respects the work of unity, the other bodies of Christendom have more to do in moving towards them, than they towards others. It does appear to us, that in a most important sense, the Church of Cranmer is to be a great centre of unity. Not that Church as having the bishoprick, in which respect if there be argument at all, it lies with the bishop of Rome; but that Church as, in the good Providence of God, having preserved the Apostolic usage and phraseology of the practical Christian life. If there be any reality or force in the entire argument we are engaged in, then this work of the Episcopal Church is one for which, at some time, others of Christ's Churches shall rise up and call her blessed. And, O, if those of her bishops and writers who are so vainly seeking to make out of her what her constitution never contained, and so in combating other denominations, have found themselves upon ground where they can only maintain their position by an incessancy of outcry against Rome, which reveals to all who have watched it, the constant and felt uneasiness of their predicament—O if they would but fall back to the true dignity of their Providential place, and leave Rome and the sects to Christ, so should that Church have a vantage ground in the great work of charity that has been given to few of the Churches of Christ in any age. We are perfectly well aware of what we are here saying, and we are well aware that no man can, in these times, speak thus without being misunderstood, nevertheless truth is stronger than all, and it shall overcome. It is sufficient for our own conscience that we know that a man may, under any form of the Church which possesses all that the New Testament expressly gives, in perfect good faith seek

a return to the primitive form of religion without leaving his Church, unless his Church have placed some positive order in his way, which the Presbyterian Church has never done. It has not done it even in Scotland, although from political circumstances the divines of that Church did assume an unliturgic direction. It was not so with the English Presbyterians. To the greater number of those who composed the Westminster Assembly, the essential forms and usages, the whole pietistic method of expression, of the early Church, was the settled habit of their faith, as is plainly enough shown in the Confession of Faith, which has in reality a more decidedly churchly tone than the Episcopal Articles. Still less perhaps was it so with the Continental Presbyterian Churches; a remarkable verification of which we have in the fact that the Continental Presbyterians who fled to this country, have so generally become Episcopalians—not by accident, not for the sake of the bishoprick, for there was no such Episcopal Church here at the time, but because the liturgical form of religion in that Church was more consentaneous to their own faith, than they found the Presbyterian or Independent to be. We have besides another evidence to the sense that a Presbyterian Christian can, as well as any other man, legitimately draw back to his religious habits those portions of the primitive form and method which accident has robbed him of, in the fact that a distinct portion of the Presbyterian Church in our land is, as such seeking to do this very thing. The work which the German Reformed Church is here doing we do most humbly and thankfully recognize as the work of Divine Providence. We see here a Church which, so far as we can find to the contrary, is holding with only a surer steadfastness to the pure evangelic teachings of its standards, and at the same time seeking to carry out the full utterance of the Creed in these primitive forms and usages, which the Church has left as its natural utterances. It is thus doing what the New Testament does, when it prays for grace under the form of bread, when it helps the

no -

sanctified under the form of water, when it gives thanks in the form of Trinity-worship; in a word, when it gives the sacrament as the reality to faith. This we take to be the distinguishing characteristic of Calvinism. The doctrine of the decrees is not the distinctive characteristic of Calvinism. We believe Calvin's statement of that doctrine, we believe it to be more exhaustive of Holy Scripture than any other statement of it, and we have never seen any lowering of it that was not liable at a point to which it must be run, if it hold any election at all, to precisely the objections made against predestination. But this, we strongly repeat it, is not the peculiar doctrine of Calvin. The peculiar doctrine of the system of faith called Calvinistic, is that of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Redeemer and Strength of men, *ever present in His ordinances, and especially present to faith in the Holy Supper.* We state this not as a paradox, we state it as a fact, which has presented itself from the beginning to the end of Calvin's works, life, and letters. And we further see that while this portion of the Presbyterian Church is returning to the liturgic method of faith and worship, it is increasing in Christian charity. It is receiving bad usage with a Christian spirit, and it is enlarging rather than narrowing its idea of the Church. In every way in which it has been tested, we behold marks of a Divine assistance. To our mind the example of the German Reformed Church, in this matter, is of immense meaning. If we have obtained any real truth in studying the questions of the Church and of the Divine life in the light of their aesthetic bearing, then a right return to the primitive forms of faith and religion, should humanize the man, enlarge his views, and render charitable his feelings, should increase his capability of worshipping together with any part of the Church of Christ, should bring more men into his idea of the Church than the conceptions of any human system can allow, and should bear patiently with the weaknesses, defects, excesses, and at last with the personal revilings of all. It means the same, in our view, whether we say that this is, under

grace, a *liturgic* work, or, an *aesthetic* work. It behooves us then to inquire carefully as to what is the truth, what is the fact, as it respects this aspect of our subject. What do we learn from the creations, constitutions, and word of our Lord? Is it according to His will that we shall seek to help a man to become a good man by calling in the aid of aesthetic culture? Under proper limitations, Yes. Our warrant is that our Maker so addresses us in nature, giving to sense the form of the idea that thus we may recognize the idea and acknowledge the Lord; that He has dealt with us after the same method in the communications of His grace, in the Church and in the sacraments. I am sure from my own constitution and from the works and word of God, that my very nature is prefigured to this discipline, and I am doubly sure of it, when I find myself in the visible Church. When blindness shuts my eye from the form, when deafness closes my ear to the speech, when sickness keeps me from the assembly, and when death lays my senses for a season in the ground, I may be a good man apart from the manifest form, which is always for me, except as Providence prevent, the indispensable completion of the reality and the truth. The Lord has given me no right to feel that I am a Christian, remaining wilfully unbaptized, or that I am living by the Lord Jesus, remaining wilfully from the sacrament of his body and blood. And, of course, the contrary is true. If I am baptized into Christ, I have, through the Spirit, who witnesseth with the water, a good hope through faith that I am dead to sin. If I partake of the consecrated bread and wine, I have a like good hope through faith that I am one with Christ. And, again, albeit I may not have a prayerful spirit at the time, the good Master has given me a daily prayer which I may use and so get a prayerful spirit. I may not have a praising spirit, but it is my proper privilege to sing a song of praise. I am not in the full heart to do a charitable deed, but I can go and do it, and so get charity. Or, still again, my heart is burdened and my speech perplexed, not knowing what to say or to pray for as I ought—I can answer all by pray-

ing, "Thy will be done." Or, my heart is full of thankfulness to Christ for the abundance of his gifts in life, providence, and grace, and I want to say so to the Lord—where shall I begin, what shall I say? I will say, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord, glory be to Thee." In a word, we find two distinct kinds of provision made for men, alike in the world of nature and in the world of grace, the one is specific, the other is liturgic or aesthetic. The two are one, and the truth is one. The science of botany indicates truth, but the flower contains the truth. Whichever way we turn we find that to our faculties for truth and goodness, are exhibited those forms which are to the idea as the container to the contained. When I see the rainbow in the cloud I hear the voice of Jehovah saying to me, "Go on with your labors in hope, seed time and harvest shall duly come and return," and I hear this not in the way of explicit speech, but by seeing it in a form of unspeakable beauty which I could neither see nor feel, had I not an aesthetic, a liturgic, a sacramental nature within me.

Now then the Church, the Christian nation, has its Art, as well as the world, and far more powerful, because far more holy. The Christian nation has its art in sacred song. It has its hymns adapted to that capacity of sacred song. Let us see then which has the advantage, the present style or the apostolic, the didactic or the aesthetic. Here, for example, is a Methodist hymn book, an Episcopalian, a Lutheran, &c. They all contain some good hymns, hymns in which all good men ought to acknowledge the gifts of the Spirit to the Churches. But they all contain a great many, by far the largest number, which are not good hymns, except for private use, and that for the same reason that the private prayers of Brainard or Payson are not good prayers for the congregation. The early Church had such hymns also, but they have dropped out, as the most of ours will do, because the Church cannot, in her public capacity, assimilate them. There are a few of the hymns of the early Church, however, which have not dropped out, and especially two, the Morning Hymn of the Church, and the

Te Deum. Now when I examine that hymn, "Gloria in Excelsis," and compare it with Holy Scripture, and find that it seems most remarkably to have been cast in the same method in which those Scriptures give their forms for the feeling of worship, and that it actually is to my highest faith and holiest feelings incomparably more satisfactory than any or all the private hymns of all our hymn books, who shall tell me that I am not doing my soul good by acquiring the habit of using it? Or, again, when I find that the very pronouncing of the Apostles' Creed does sometimes stir my soul as with the sound of a trumpet, and always tends to bring me nigh to the mystical Body, who shall hinder me and my children from daily saying the Creed at our family altar that so we may feel that the Church of God is in our house? Should one answer, it is formalism; I reply, I am commanded daily to resort to the same kind of formalism in the Lord's Prayer, in the not neglecting to assemble with the saints, in the singing of praise in the congregation, and am addressed by the same as I walk to the church under the maternal sky of heaven and amidst the trees and grass and flowers of earth. If the reply should be, Our people are, in Providence, so trained to a specific and didactic method of devotion, that the Morning Hymn and the Creed would bewilder their faith, then I say, It behooves me to see that thing and to deal carefully with it, and not to fly in the face of Providence, and did I not see as clearly and as scripturally as I do that these primitive forms are far better than the present ones, I would accept that Providential condition as an imperative one. As it is, I believe it to be my duty to seek, in the spirit of Christian love and wisdom, to carry them back in these particulars to the early Church, and to the fuller method of the Sacred Scriptures. In so doing I should do what I call the work of aesthetic, or liturgic culture. It is properly called aesthetic, because it is that part of our nature which is addressed. The liturgic form and method of the Church is the Art of the Church. The reason why the Te Deum is worth for devotion more than all our hymn books with-

out it, is of a like nature with that which makes the Poem of Milton to be worth, for the imagination, more than all the poems that have been written since. I could not find the Church, or come to the Saviour, were I not a creature of sense, and the very thought is profanity, of what the Church and sacraments would be to me, being a creature of sense, had I not a faculty for faith, reason, imagination and sentiment.

We are well aware there are many pious and excellent minds which will not feel the reality of the above course of reasoning. To some all our words may seem like an empty beating of air. These will be of two kinds, to the one of whom express statements stand as the forms of truth. We might say to them, Now are you not then doing a like thing? You lay down in so many terms the doctrine, it may be, of the Lord's Supper, your faith is reposing upon that statement as the truth. To you the statement is the form which you are using precisely as I would use the divine Form itself, in which I think, I am the safest; for I say the truth of the sacrament is in the sacrament, and not otherwise than indicated in any doctrine of the sacrament, and I am sure I have of the Lord a nature which so accepts it. To another class, religion is not a matter of doctrine at all, but of emotion. Their faith will very much express itself in sacred song. The difference between their method and ours, except as they find themselves able to originate a new song with every fresh outburst of feeling, is that they use the liturgy of individual Christian poets, which is not a liturgy, while we would use the liturgy of the Church which is. We freely admit that there is, for the present, a certain strange churchly sound to our ears, in the early forms of the Church, a sound that is sometimes called Papistic, sometimes Episcopal, sometimes it is called Formalism. Let us request such a Christian objector to take the Apostles' Creed, and read, in connection with it, certain of St. Paul's expressions concerning the Church, as in the Epistles to Timothy, to the Ephesians, Colossians, &c. See if they be not within the same region. Or, if he has ever been in the

habit of attending the Episcopal service, I would ask him if a feeling has not come over him when the congregation have come to the Creed, at least of the same indescribable character of unseen grandeur as has been excited in his mind by the reading the inspired references to the mystical Body? Just at this point, we would arrest the present progress of our argument, to ask the same individual, if he has ever entered, say at the close of day, within a Gothic church, such as Trinity, in New York, or better still, St. Mark's, in Philadelphia, and whether the mere architecture of the building has not excited something of the same feeling—something that may be called a feeling of the Church? And furthermore, to ask him whether he ever found that feeling decidedly excited by any other kind of architecture, by the Grecian, for example, or by the Renaissance? It can easily be tested. Let any Christian man of any denomination of Christians pass from Trinity church in New York to St. Paul's, in the same city, or from St. Mark's, in Philadelphia, to the West Arch St. church, in the same city, and his aesthetic Christian instinct will attest to him at once which architecture means the Church.

We may now, upon a wider field and with a more general reference, ask ourselves again the question, Is aesthetic culture to be a part in the process through which the Christian family is to be brought back to unity? Is Christian Art to do some part in promoting true catholicity? And here again we must say, most probably, Yes. We have no right to say that the Lord sent the chosen nation into Egypt to the end they should receive the cultivation of Egyptian art, but we can safely say such was the effect. So that we find it a matter of fact that a part of the work of the preparation of that people for the Mosaic Law, was the influence of Egyptian art and civilization upon them. Here aesthetic culture, even that of a gentile nation, clearly appears as a forerunner of faith. It seems to us that no one who has noticed the number of Egyptian particulars in the ritual which the Lord of Moses enjoined upon his people, can resist the force of the argument. We see no other

way of explaining the fact. And then, in the next place, we find the imagination, the aesthetic man we mean, most forcefully addressed throughout the whole Ceremonial Law—so that aesthetic culture is made both the forerunner and the hand-maid of faith. We find, moreover, that as this Ritual was altered in the progress of the Theocracy, it was altered by adding to its splendor. Assuredly no religion ever possessed a more visibly glorious service than that of the Jews, in the days of Solomon ; no religion ever more fully and more profoundly addressed man's aesthetic nature than did that of the old covenant, in type and song and liturgy ; so that it is not easy to see how the unimaginative Jew could have lived up to the meaning or the grace of his religion. It is certain, however, that there were few of such, if the writings of the Old Testament be the criterion to judge by, and it is equally certain that under such a ritual there could have been but few of such. Taking the ancient covenant, then, into view, with its sacraments, temple, ritual, and kingly government, we surely find that in the Dispensation of grace it is the same Lord who has clothed the earth with beauty and whose Spirit garnisheth the heavens, and who hath given to men a nature therein to know His love and goodness.

If now we follow the course of history downwards we find the Divine Providence causing to be done over again on a catholic scale for the Church, that which Egypt was caused to do for Israel. The Grecian people stand, by the world's consent, the great national representative of the higher faculties of the natural man. They were manifestly a people in the hand of the Lord, to do their work in preparing the nations for the coming of Christ in the flesh. It is equally manifest, as it respects the character of their part in this work of preparation, that it was that of the education of the finer faculties. They were the high thinkers and the beautifying artists of the world. Their work was, in virtue of the nature of it, the world's contribution to the true work of the Harbinger of faith in turning the hearts of fathers and children towards each other. The

mechanical collecting of the nations was effected by Rome, but there could have been no real fusion had not Rome Hellenized the nations as she conquered them.

This work of collecting and humanizing (we use the word for the same reason that aesthetic studies used to be called humanity studies) the nations on the part of Greece and Rome, seems to be the heathen parallel of that preparative shadow of the true coming which was predicted among the holy nation by Malachi. The rebellious family of man must be brought into one before the Lord came, who was truly to make us one, that is in Himself through the Church. Now that this mission of Greece was a work, mainly done by means of aesthetic culture, no man can deny, unless he deny that there was ever a Greek nation, that the Roman conquerors carried everywhere that nation's art and letters, and that when this work was fully done, the Lord came. In one word, then, men were *civilized* in preparation for the Lord's coming, and it is very certain that no nation ever yet was civilized, except as the Fine Arts mainly did the work. If this does not show the principle, that aesthetic culture is a forerunner to faith, we do not see how history can show anything.

It only remains that we take the Christian Church, having thus received her contribution from the nations, and see if, as in the case of the former covenant, the aesthetic man is not still addressed, so that this kind of culture, here as there, shall remain both the forerunner and the handmaid of faith. Here truly the glory of the latter house transcends that of the former. Theirs were the glorious shadows, ours the glorious substance; theirs the invisible, ours the visible; theirs the typical, ours the real and the true. If the Old Testament, with its visible signs, furnished food for the sanctified imagination of man, much more does the New Covenant, whose manifested Lord is now seated in the heavens, and whose true sacraments, and whose sacramental Body we have upon earth.

We are not of the number of those who imagine that a man may be civilized, or educated, or in any other way

disciplined into faith. It is the gift of God, it is the creation of the life-giving Spirit. Nevertheless, as we see that doctrinal instruction can do much in the way of pointing a man towards faith, so also do we believe that aesthetic culture can do much in the same direction. It will not only help the Christian child to teach him the catechism, it will help him to take him to Church, and also to let him witness the sacrament, when he may be as yet too young to partake it. Nor is it otherwise than plainly to be observed, how, in a more general sense, the aesthetic element in education tends to humanize and render kindly the man. Selfishness, hard-heartedness, an apparent incapacity for the recognition of the obligations of brotherly love, the absence of any real feeling of the unity of mankind—all this, in the Christian state, comes of the over-cultivation of the understanding, which is by its very nature the faculty of isolation and division. It is quite possible to fill a child's head with the calculations of astronomy or the technicalities of geology, to a degree that shall blind his heart to the glory of the stars and of the earth. And so is it possible for the study of political philosophy to alter a man's conception of the human family to that of a herd. Let the education of the boy consist of mathematics and logic; or, to a proper amount of these, let there be added the classics and arts—the supposition involves the whole question at issue. We are no disparagers of science. It is doing a great and noble work for us, not only for the citizen, but for the man; it is most salutary, it furnishes the strengthening ribs of art, and hence it is that science has no meaning which finds not the end of its mission in the form of the truth. Here the synthetic process comes in, and then comes in the work of unity. The previous work was one of definition and division; necessary and helpful when done with a view to reconstruction, unmeaning and most injurious over the whole man, when not. That man will find it hard to have faith and hard to have love.

It is in virtue of man's higher powers, reason, conscience, imagination, that he can be a religious being. Had he not

this faculty for the infinite, the incomprehensible, the mystical, how could he have faith, how charity? It is, accordingly, notorious that a right aesthetic culture does tend to refine, ennoble, expand and make catholic the man. Through these wider powers he realizes a wider world, in the cultivation of feeling and sentiment, he grows humane and kindly. It will by no means of itself, any more than didactic instruction, make a man good or kindly, but it will help him, and if he have the heart, it will greatly help him. It helped David and Isaiah in the olden time—it helps little children now. Let the Christian mother by all means seek to indoctrinate her child into filial confidence, and yet one motherly look is worth the whole of it, and the child comes provided with a faculty, in virtue of which it recognizes the same. And what man ceases thus to recognize all truth, even the highest and holiest, to his life's end, except, indeed, as the hardness of his heart or the prejudices of his head, shut out the light from his spirit? What good man but has felt, under the kindly bowings of the unfathomed sky, or amidst the breathing balminess of a summer's morning, the goodness of God with a power and assurance beyond the compass of all other kind of speech? What good man but has felt the earth and air and all the world witness of the Sabbath, in a way beyond all power of articulate utterance? If the aesthetic man, as such, is not the recipient of truth, if sight and sound in nature, and sight and sound in the Church, are not religious to the good man, then there would seem to be a part of our nature, and that too, if judged by the grandeur and loveliness of its impressions, a most powerful part of our earthly nature, which would seem for the present to be in vain. And as by the culture of this truth feeling faculty I am assisted in rising above the "idols" of place and tribe, am enabled to feel a wider horizon than that of self, opinion, or country, and led by this expansion of my view to a wider sympathy with men; so also by the same am I assisted in my practical intercourse with them, even to trust their looks when their words do not assure me, to repose in their abil-

ity to the sudden demands of an emergency, because I feel the sure presence of a character which the sum total of their previous words and actions would by no means warrant. The ground upon which at last and most we all act in the intercourse of life and charity, is a sacramental (or aesthetic, or liturgic) ground; one man's countenance says a certain thing, another man's heart by the eye interprets it, and the conduct follows. The signs of love, grief, and sympathy, of penitence, forgiveness and reconciliation, are more forceful to all men than their words. The universal heart and reason of man are ever more confident in the exclamations of language, than in any other of its parts of speech. Not having this aesthetic nature, I do not see how I can be a man, a citizen, or a churchman. By it my spirit recognizes virtues, powers, and governments, and by it, through grace, am I kept from denying them.

To the conscientious Christian, who fears to carry this aesthetic part of his being to his Church, we can only say that the sacred Scriptures require him to carry it into his religion, and how he can dare to separate his religion from his Church we cannot comprehend. Those psalms of David which we all sing, and which are so full of worship, drawn from the sight and sound of nature, and which were composed to the tunings of his harp, and which were echoed back from choir to choir by the thousands of singers and instruments of the Temple service—how can the Christian take those psalms to the Church and not feel the appropriateness of taking along with them the responsive music to which they are in their very inspired construction set? Or if his conscience reject the instrument, then why not reject the great organ of nature, of whose notes they are so full, why not erase all nature references from them? Or how indeed can such a Christian sing at all? It would sound strangely should the preacher intone his sermon, but not more strange than singing ought to sound to the man who holds that nothing is for edification in the Christian Church, except the plain didactic service. How any metrical rhythm or musical sound can be made consistent with a theory of

articulate instruction that excludes the organ, it is hard to see. If our brethren of the Church of Scotland would stop to consider that the high-church intoning of the service is far more consistent with their theory than congregational singing is, it might help to startle them away from their persistent and most injurious fondness on this point. Or if, seeing it and adopting it, they should go back to the responsive chanting of the Psalms of David in their churches, then would we truly thank them, and forgive them much as to that which is past.

Again, we would ask the fearful Christian, Do you not feel that your religion often comes to you in this very way, nay, that it always so comes to you when it comes most strongly? We mean, does it not come by faith, which is beyond sense and apparent subjective reason? Are not your religious feelings most powerful when most above this world, when least immediately associated with your self-consciousness, or with any self-conscious process? In a word, are you not most religiously strong when most feeling the powers and realities of the world to come? And is it so that it is your duty to go to a church so naked to the imagination that you must fall back upon a purely self-conscious process in order to beget within you that very feeling which the Church is intended to excite? No architecture, no prescriptive service, no visible sign and witness of the communion of saints? The Apostle, in Hebrews, tells us to what mount we have come, and the Church of all ages proclaims it, and yet we, having not as yet, by architecture, not by ministerial robe, not by creed, response, amen, or liturgy, alas, not even by the Lord's Prayer, or by any other visible sign, except on Communion-day, scarcely a form to invite and help forward our faith to the recognition of the Church; none at least which we use as such, none sufficient to witness and enforce its own use. Not so did the Apostle set in order the things for which Timothy awaited his coming in the Church, the Pillar of the truth.

We are well enough aware that such a statement of the

items of our deficiencies, and the ground on which such statement is made, would startle many. It is not spiritual religion. We reply it is spiritual religion. It is not the Reformed faith, we reply it is the Reformed faith. We could by a mere catena of quotations from the general body of the Reformed symbols, and abundantly from the Westminster Confession of Faith, and from the ordinary sermons of the men who composed it, from the Cripplegate Lectures, for example, without any unfairness, produce language on the Sacraments, baptismal, eucharistic, and ministerial phraseology and usage, which would as much startle the prevalent congregationalism of our Presbyterian Church, as can be fairly construed from any thing we have said in the course of the present discussion. Let two instances from our most high and noble Confession (and the more we study it the more high and noble shall we find it) suffice; the ninth chapter of the Directory, and the 167th question of the Larger Catechism. To which of our congregations has "*the grace of baptism*" come to be a phrase at all, except as it has come in as the adopted stigma of an outside heresy? Which of our Sunday schools, which of our churches show that the children of the Church are really trained in the Apostles' Creed? Is it possible for candor to take the Assembly's Confession and say that the Presbyterian Church of America is really acting and speaking in all respects according to its style and usage? And are not these respects among the most important of all to the Church, as the visible Pillar of truth, seeing they have respect to the sacramental phraseology and usage of faith? Still, upon the ground of the logical mind, we are all but frail and partial truth-seers; even the express word of the Confession will mean to us what we have predetermined. I see a proper sacramental and liturgic element in the Confession. I own that I wish to see it—you see it not. I perceive that you do not wish to see it—where then is our hope of unity?

It lies in a ground above reason, it lies in faith. Where then is the working process of the corresponding region?

Our hope and trust is that it resides in religious Art—that of a silent, unsuspected, homogenous working, which doctrinal discussion can never be till we are perfect, and then there shall be no place for it. We behold a Church containing within its own bosom far greater differences of doctrinal expression than exist among ourselves, and yet that Church is powerfully held to unity by its religious Art, its noble and most scripturally “excellent and beautiful” Liturgy. The Liturgy which holds that Church in one, though its strongest Baptismal phraseology is an authentic Presbyterian insertion, would, the most incipient direct attempt towards it, at present fearfully harass our Church. We cannot get back our inheritance by special suit. It must work its way in equity. Let us recover the feeling of the Church, sacraments, and order (ministry) which are in our Standards, and so will the Liturgy make known its day. Christian Architecture contains that feeling, our hope is that it will help to enforce it. If our views of Art are true, it will. Few Presbyterian Church-sessions would consent, upon this ground, to build a Gothic church; nevertheless we are, some how, beginning to articulate in Gothic; our hope is that the Gothic will begin to articulate in us, so that at last we shall come to the full speech of the aesthetic Church, which is the glorious symbol, organ, and Liturgy of the Cruciform Duomo, the visible house of the Lord for the earthly man in Christ.

We promised to show how the Gothic Architecture is the mystic symbol of the Church. We cannot do it. We must get the pointed Cathedral, and no man shall need the exposition. However, Has any one chanced to attend the Cathedral Service? If not, have you read descriptions of it by those who have? Letters of our countrymen traveling in England furnish us with many such—and the impression seems ever to be one and the same. They will have very different views as to the government, society, and matters and things in general, but here there is a remarkable agreement. There must be something permanent here, something unfluctuating, veritable, and real. Intelligent

Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist clergymen, tell us in nearly identical terms of the deep solemnity of the service, and of the wonderful power with which it took hold of their deepest religious feelings. Now we hold that our language contains a single word which is adequate more than any other to indicate the character of the state of mind thus excited; it is best described by saying, "the service transported me into the region of holy mystery." The principles of this world were fallen, and the powers of the world to come became a presence to the worshipper's faith, became so through the liturgic religious sense abiding in every child of Adam. In that Cathedral *were* the angels and the saints of old, and all that invisible congregation of which the Apostle speaks.

We may, having witnessed the service, assist the mind in reproducing the feeling, or not having witnessed it, may help the mind to a realizing of the description, in some such way as that already recommended in a previous part of our discussion; by recalling the state of feeling resulting from the contemplation of the Gospel, or of some part of the Gospel, in its light of the mystery of godliness. The feeling will be excited by reflection upon the inspired descriptions of the Church, by thoughts of the heavenly powers and hierarchies, by continued meditation on the "Communion of Saints." In favorable states of mind and heart we will experience it upon meeting the single phrase "the Holy Catholic Church," but still more powerfully feel it by pronouncing the creed at such a time, or by overhearing a child saying it. Those gloriously awful words seem to come to our inner sense as the one voice of the innumerable Host, the countless generations, the unseen, yet present Body of the Church, repeating even as the all-conquering undertone of the boundless and ever-living flow of mighty waters, "I believe in God." There is a sound to the words of the Creed that is contained in no other language of men. When said together in the Church, it is said even with a tone which no other part of the Liturgy has begotten for itself. You may explain it as you choose;

that it is because so many millions of believing men, women, and children have for so many generations been saying these words; that it is because the words are so simple and the things contained so unspeakably grand and glorious—we do not, however, accept any explanation. What we say is that it is a fact, that the pronouncing of the Creed does at times produce the state of feeling of which we are speaking, a state of feeling which our language describes by no other word except that of mystical.

And here we say that the same feeling, as to the character of it, is excited in the heart of the Christian man by the Cathedral itself. And this is our meaning when saying that the Cathedral embodies the Creed, that it is the place in which to say the Creed, the place which shall echo and *réecho* its authentic amen. And herein it is the place and symbol of the Catholic Church. The feeling with which you find yourself in the midst of the true Christian Architecture, is the one paramount feeling of the holy and saving mystery of the Faith. It is exhibited by no other Architecture. It is approached in the Byzantine, it is nearly overcome in the later Gothic, it is not only lost, but thrice dead in the this-world stare of the carnal Renaissance. You may object that the feeling is not in the thing, that we put it there. Still our answer is, The Cathedral was built by the Church. But if it is *not* in it, then the love that the child has felt in its mother's voice, is not in it; the godly sorrow which you have seen in the face of the poor penitent in your congregation, is not in it; the goodness of the Father, which the Psalmist encourages us to find in earth and sky, is not in them. And, in fine, I ask, What is the thing that you yourself do feel under the Gothic nave? Seeing you subjectively deny it, of course you cannot subjectively make it, and hence one of the most overpowering feelings you ever had on earth is a nonentity!

As it respects the feeling of the Church, excited by Cathedral Art, it is easy enough to make out a private explanation of the *modus operandi*; as to which we have to say

that here, as in the instance of the Creed, and as in the interpretation of such mystic incidents as the woman in the Gospel touching our Saviour's garments, the anointing the eyes of the blindman with clay and spittle, the breathing upon the Apostles before the ascension—every one has a right to his own interpretation; the thing which is of importance, is the continued acknowledgment of the mystic nature of the facts. Had this rule been kept in mind, the modern exegesis would have been saved from some of its distressing, in certain cases most profane, interpretations. In the case of the Cathedral, as indeed in the case of every mystic fact, all men feel the thing; the rationalist even, who is vexing the heart of faith with his unholy inquisitiveness near the very Cross, must, if he have a heart, at some moment have felt the mystic holiness and awfulness of that which followed the piercing of our Saviour's side. If his explanation deny the mystery, let him keep it to himself; there yet may be warmth enough in his heart to neutralize the dreary poison of his mind.

That which we can say, then, of Christian Architecture, is, that it is, according to its own way, a Form of mystery addressed to the mystical sense of the Christian believer. Its effectiveness, as such, is *not* due to its cruciform plan, though that is doubtless a part of it. It is a part of it inasmuch as this form lies at the foundation of the faith, and with this form the faith finishes. The Christian child takes up the Cross at the commencement of its life, and the Christian man is found holding it toward the Lord, as he is departing. So the Cathedral is founded in the Cross, and bears the Cross everywhere, not always specifically, yet always contains it, and finishes in the Cross at last. Upon mere abstract grounds, also, is the cruciform plan an integral element of the style, inasmuch as this religious arrangement so immeasurably adds to the artistic vastness, and the linear power of the interior. Nor is it due to the pointed arch, though this too is assuredly a part of it, both as that form coöperates with the universally aspiring character of the style; as well as in the deeper sense, that at

that arch-point there is ever brooding a characteristic Gothic expressiveness, by reason apparently of causes too ultimate to be approached, except in a treatise which should discuss the difficult subject of linear phenomena in some of its most abstruse bearings. He that can tell us how it is that the base-line of the human figure, which is a geometric right line, can take on the myriad grace and beauty of the endless flow of line which clothes the body, and yet itself never be absent from the whole man, never seen as a right line and yet always present as such, in the strength, the bearing, and the equilibrium of the system, producing an immediate sense of distortion the moment that equilibrium is violated;—or that can tell us how it is that beneath the arch-way of the human brow, or in the outline of the facial angle, resides an entity of expression which is recognized and felt by every man and by every age of man—even he may tell us how it is that the converging lines of the pointed arch bear upward and deposit a certain entity of expression at the arch-point, which is different in character from that made by two converging right lines, and the like of which is found no where so much as indicated throughout the course of the circular arch. Doubtless the final meeting of those high curves in the point of the true Cathedral arch, makes a churchly spot, makes a place at which dwells somewhat of the power of this great mystic fact, and that is all we have to say about it.

So neither is the full rounding of the mystic phenomenon of Cathedral Art, made out in the deep and dark channelings of the piers and arches, where the endowed and haunted atmosphere of the place finds a local habitation; nor yet in the darkening of the light, which helps to make the whole interior space a consenting presence filled with the one same spirit; these doubtless also constitute a part in the sum total of the effect. The fact is here. It remains for all Christian men. Stand beneath the nave arches of the Christian Cathedral, and your heart attests that you are in the very place of worship. Here is somewhat that is worshipping with you and for you. Here is

the manifest creation, yea, here is the one body bowing the knee to Christ. Here is the visible organ of the invisible Choir, whose notes are heard in being seen. Here you feel the inspired descriptions of the Church. Here you can indeed say the Creed. Here, in a word, with a powerfulness not elsewhere often felt, do you seem to realize in your heart and spirit the meaning of that vast word, the Church. Here, if you wish further to revolve the feeling, here you behold the Catholic faith in the manifest light of the great mystery of godliness, "though still uttered in words so vast to the sense that we catch but the shadow of their grandeur and are overwhelmed by that."

The most obvious objection to the argument for the spiritual-real Presence, or which is of course the same thing, the spiritual-real unity of the militant Church, as inferred from the fact of the resulting invisible unity of Cathedral Art, is that that very Cathedral was itself wrought out by the militant Church as constituted under a visible representative of unity. Our reply to this is, that such a constitution was necessary both for the time and for the work itself. Had it been intended that that visible sign of unity should be a permanent order, then would the piers and the arches and the ceiling of the great building have continued in the solid. The Byzantine would never have taken on the spiritual glory of the Pointed Cathedral. The architectural answer, therefore, to the objection does but bring out the greater force of the architectural argument. The Church, the true Church, the Church that was blessing the nations *is* the identical Church that developed the Cathedral, and that Church at the period when the work was done, was constituted under a visible executive head and representative of unity. We find no difficulty in acknowledging it as the Lord's doing, any more than we have in seeing the hand of Providence in the centralizing of the old covenant under the Theocratic King. We should feel sorry to have any difficulty in recognizing the Church that completed the Cathedral as the true Church of Christ, and for the same reason, we do as clearly see and feel that when

that work of the ages was done, when the Church had at last uttered herself in a form of Art which gives the grandest conception of all earthly things to the Christian man for his creed, which constrains him to feel the force of heavenly things by looking away from all earthly things—then am I sure that the work of the central executive is done. The old Roman bishopric we reverence as the elect instrument of Divine Providence in guiding the Church through the great work of its aesthetic evolution, and had the bishop of Rome handed over that Cathedral, into which it was his appointed work to lead the nations, we would reverence him. Under the sanctions of this Christian Art the protestant will meet him still, and will listen to his words in unison with all the equal rulers and pastors of the Lord's flock, together holding the Head, from which all the Body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. But for the protestant to yield any acknowledgment of that bishopric as a divine centre of unity which has degraded the invisible majesty of Christian Art into the Heathenish worldliness of a Roman-Greek Italian palace,—we, in the light of our subject, cannot see how it is possible without danger of a denial of the faith. There can be little hope in this quarter till the pope gets out of St. Peters.

The encouraging import of our subject as it respects the restoration of unity, lies in the fact of the organic, ever-germinating progress of the aesthetic man. Correct views of the Sacraments will bring back the Creed, the Creed will bring the Church, and the Church will find the Cathedral. May we not also hope that Cathedral Art will make known the Creed and Liturgy to those who are now beginning to use it without them?

W. A. D.

ART. IV.—THE FIRST LITURGY FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER IN THE REFORMED CHURCH.

Order of administration for the Lord's Supper, in remembering or giving thanks to Christ, as it was practised in Zurich in the year, as we count, MDXXV.

It may be interesting to the readers of the Review to see the form which was used for the celebration of the Holy Supper in Zurich, and throughout Reformed Switzerland, at the very beginning of the Reformation. The form we translate was "printed in Zurich by Christophorum Froschouer on the 6th day of April, 1525," and is evidently the first one ever used in the Reformed Church. It is preceded by an introduction and a preface, in the first of which Christians are congratulated on account of the disappearance of error in the Church, and in view of the restoration of Christian worship to its purity and simplicity; and in the second, a number of directions are given in regard to the proper celebration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper:

After the title the introduction is as follows:

"Christ, Matth. xi: 28:

Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give ye rest.

We greet all true believers who are devoted to the word of God in Zurich, and all Pastors, and wish unto them grace and peace from God.

After a long season of error and darkness, dearly beloved, we rejoice in the true way and the true light, which God our heavenly Father, through his grace, has opened unto us; which mercy we esteem the more, and receive and embrace with greater desire, as the error has been dangerous and injurious to us. Though numberless errors have hitherto prevailed to the injury of faith and love, yet we think not the least one has been the misuse of the Holy Supper. This, after a long captivity, like as the Passover among the children of Israel in the days of the kings

Hezekiah and Josiah, we have, as we hope, by the help of God, reconquered and restored to its proper use. This has been done at least so far as pertains to the substance of the sacrament itself. In regard to the ceremonies that accompany it, what we have done may perhaps be regarded by some as too much, and by others as too little. In this, however, every congregation is free to enjoy its own opinion; for in regard to this point we will not dispute with any. For what injuries and defections from God have till now grown out of many of these ceremonies all believers no doubt well understand. For this reason we have thought it good, in the use of the Holy Supper, to prescribe to our people as few ceremonies and as little church pomp as possible, so that the old error may not in time creep in again. The Holy Supper is itself a ceremony—though one instituted by Christ Himself—which is sufficient. Still, in order that the ordinance may not be celebrated in a way too bleak and bare, and that something may be yielded to human weakness, we have as in this form, accompanied its celebration with such ceremonies as we believe to be suited in some measure, to excite devotion, and prepare the heart in a spiritual way to remember the death of Christ, to increase faith and brotherly love, to promote holiness of life, and to subdue vice in the hearts and lives of men. In so doing, however, it has not been our design to set aside for other congregations any such ceremonies as have perhaps been promotive of devotion among them, such as singing and some others of the same nature; for we entertain the hope that all pastors in all places are sincerely concerned in every way to build up God's people and to win many to his service. Since this remembrance of the passion of Christ, and this thanksgiving for his death is to be a communion for Christians, and is to follow an innocent and pious course of life, we have also directed, in accordance with the divine will, that all who by an improper mode of life mock and pollute it, be excluded from its participation. The way, however, in which this is to be done—since time fails us to do it now—will hereafter be presented in a little book by itself. The grace of Christ be with you all!"

Then follows what is called (Ein Vorred)

"A PREFACE.

Since it has been shown from God's word that for a long time the Lord's Supper has been misused, it will be necessary to separate from it every thing that does not agree with the divine word. And since this remembering is a thanksgiving and a rejoicing before Almighty God for the act of goodness which He has shown towards us through His Son, who in this festival repast or eucharist doth appear, and show to those who believe that they are redeemed by the death and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—on Maunday Thursday the youngest of those among the people who are believers and have come to the knowledge of God and His word, and who desire to celebrate this Eucharist or Supper, shall come into the level space between the choir and the passage, the males on the right and the females on the left hand; the rest shall take their places under the arch, on the galleries and in other places. When the sermon is over,—bread and wine in their natural state,* having previously been placed upon a table in the space between the choir and the passage—the mode and manner of celebrating this act of the remembrance of Christ, as He himself has instituted it, shall be rehearsed with open, intelligible, German words (as in the manner following). Then those properly set apart to the holy office shall bear the bread, in broad wooden plates from one seat to another and so permit each one with his own hand to break off a piece, or mouthful, and eat it. The wine shall be borne around in the same way; so that no one in partaking need move from his place.† When this has been done praise and thankgivings shall be given to God with public words,

* "Ungeheblet brot und wyn," &c. That is these elements shall not be specially prepared by any change, or mixture of other things with them; but shall be the same in kind as they are in common use.

† Bullinger informs us that the eucharist was celebrated through the whole country in the same way as in the town of Zurich, "except that in many places the sacrament is not carried around in the church—because there is a scarcity in officers to attend to this—but the people go up to the Lord's table. In other respects it is every where one and the same." See note in *Codex Liturg.* by Herm. Adalb. Daniel. Tom. III. p. 145, 146.

and with a loud intelligible voice; and at the close all the people and the congregation shall say: "Amen."

On Good Friday the middle aged shall come into the same place above-mentioned to commune, and the Eucharistic services shall be conducted in the same way, but the men and women shall be separate as already directed. On Easter the aged shall commune in the same way. The plates and cups are of wood so that the old pomp may not return again. This order, as far as it shall meet the approbation of our churches, we shall follow four times a year, namely, at Easter, Whitsuntide, in Autumn, and at Christmas."

Here follows the form or order for celebrating the Holy Eucharist, of which we here present a literal translation.

LORD'S SUPPER.

(Zurich, 1525.)

[The minister turning towards the congregation, while all stand, says the following:]

PRAYER.

O Almighty and eternal God, whom all creatures honor, worship, and praise as their Creator and Father: grant that we—poor sinners—may fulfil, with true sincerity, faith and gratitude, what thine only begotten Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, has commanded all believers to do in remembrance of His death: through the same Lord Jesus Christ thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Ghost one God throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

[Then the minister shall say:]

What will now be read is recorded in the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, 11: 20–30. "When ye come together, therefore, &c.

[The minister and the congregation shall say:]

God be praised.

[Now the minister and people shall speak the following song of praise:]

Minister—Glory to God in the highest.

Men—And on earth peace.

Women—Good will towards men.

Men—We praise Thee, we bless Thee.

Women—We worship Thee, we glorify Thee.

Men—We give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty.

Women—O Lord, the only begotten Son, JESUS CHRIST.

Men—O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that taketh away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

Women—Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.

Men—Thou that takest away the sins of the world,

Women—Hear our prayer.

Men—Thou that sittest on the right hand of God the Father,

Women—Have mercy upon us.

Men—For thou only art holy.

Women—Thou only art the Lord.

Men—Thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father.

Men and Women—Amen.

[Now the minister shall say:]

The Lord be with you.

People—And with thy Spirit.

[Then shall the minister say:]

That which will now be read is recorded in the Gospel of John, 6: 47-64.

People—The Lord be praised.

Minister—Verily, verily, I say unto you, &c., &c.

[Then the minister shall kiss the book, and say:]

For this let the name of the Lord be praised, who according to His most Holy Word, forgiveth all our sins.

People—Amen.

[Then shall the minister begin:]

I believe in God,

Men—The Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.

Women—And in Jesus Christ his only begotten Son, our Lord;

Men—Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost,

Women—Born of the Virgin Mary,

Men—Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;

Women—He descended into Hell;

Men—The third day he rose from the dead;

Women—He ascended into heaven,

Men—And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty;

Women—From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Men—I believe in the Holy Ghost;

Women—The Holy Catholic Church;

Men—The communion of Saints;

Women—The forgiveness of sins;

Men—The resurrection of the body,

Women—And the life everlasting.

Men and Women—Amen.

[Then the minister shall say:]

Now, dearly beloved, let us according to the command and institution of our Lord Jesus Christ eat of this bread and drink of this cup, which he has commanded us so to use in remembrance of Him that we may bless and give thanks unto him because he has suffered death for us, and shed his blood for the remission of our sins. Therefore let every one ask himself, according to the words of Paul, what comfort, faith and assurance he has in the Lord Jesus Christ: so that no one may call himself a believer who is not such in truth, and thus become guilty of the body and blood of Christ; also that no one may sin against the Christian Church, which is the Body of Christ. Thus let us kneel down and pray:

Minister—Our Father who art in heaven, &c.

People—Amen.

[Then the minister shall farther pray, saying:]

O Lord, Almighty God, who through Thy Spirit, hast made us one body in the unity of the faith: which body Thou hast commanded to give praise and thanks unto The

for thy good and free grace, in giving thine only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ for our sins to suffer death : grant that we may worship Thee in sincerity, that we may not by hypocrisy or falsehood offend against the truth. Grant also that we may live in such innocence as becomes Thy body and Thy children, so that the unbelieving may also learn to honor Thy name. Lord protect us, that no love of life may weaken our love to Thee. Lord increase always our faith and our confidence in Thee, who livest and reignest God forever and ever. Amen.

[Then the minister shall say :]

The Lord Jesus, the same night, &c. 1 Cor. 11 : 23-27.

[Here the elements are distributed. After all have partaken, the congregation shall return thanks, after the example of Christ, using the Cxiii Psalm. The minister shall begin thus:]

Minister—Praise ye the Lord. Praise, O ye servants of the Lord, praise the name of the Lord.

Men—Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and forever more.

Women—From the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, the Lord's name is to be praised.

Men—The Lord is high above all nations, and his glory above the heavens.

Women—Who is like unto the Lord our God, who dwelleth on high; who humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in earth.

Men—He raiseth up the poor out of the dust, and lifteth the needy that are fallen.

Women—Praise ye the Lord.

Men—Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and forevermore.

[Then the minister shall say :]

Lord, we give thanks unto Thee for all Thy gifts and mercies, who livest and reignest, God blessed for ever.

People—Amen.

Minister—Depart in peace.

Lancaster, Pa.

H. H.

ART. IV.—HUGH MILLER AS A GEOLOGIST.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS; or *Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed*. By HUGH MILLER. Author of "Old Red Sandstone," &c. With Memorials of the Death and Character of the Author. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

THE FOOTPRINTS OF THE CREATOR; or *The Asterolepis of Stromness*. By HUGH MILLER. Author of "Old Red Sandstone," &c. With a Memoir of the Author by Louis Agassiz. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1856.

THE OLD RED SANDSTONE; or *New Walks in an Old Field*. By HUGH MILLER. Author of "Footprints," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1851.

FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND AND ITS PEOPLE. By HUGH MILLER. Author of "Footprints," &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

THE BIBLE AND ASTRONOMY; *An Exposition of the Biblical Cosmology and its Relations to Natural Science*. By JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D. D., Professor of Church History in the University of Dorpat, &c. Translated by J. D. SIMONTON. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857.

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION; or *The Scriptural Cosmology with the Ancient Idea of Time-Worlds in distinction from Worlds in Space*. By TATLER LEWIS, L.L. D., Prof. of Greek in Union College. Schenectady: G. Y. Van Deogert. 1855.

THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE; or *The World-Problem*. By TATLER LEWIS, L.L. D., Prof. of Greek in Union College. Schenectady: G. Y. Van Deogert. 1856.

THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL. Edited by DAVID N. LORD. No. XXXVII, July, 1857. page 97, Art. III. "Miller's Bearing of Geology on Natural and Revealed Religion."

NOTICE OF SOME REMARKS by the late Mr. HUGH MILLER. Author of the "Testimony of the Rocks," &c. By WILLIAM PARKER FOULKE, Esq. Philadelphia: 1857.

It is exceedingly interesting to observe the order in which the sciences have claimed the attention of mankind. Earliest of all, in its beginnings, is astronomy, the objects of

In the present article we confine ourselves to the history and results of Mr. Miller's scientific pursuits,—having in a former article, page 286, of the present volume, endeavored to unfold his personal life-history. Wishing to be fully understood by the general reader, we shall avoid as far as possible the use of scientific terms. In some cases their use is unavoidable.

which were *farthest off* from the denizens of earth. Men began at the periphery of their vision. Next came the *exact* and the *abstract* sciences, the sciences mathematical and metaphysical,—the former having for their objects the relations of magnitude, form and number, and the latter the occult laws of thought, and those entities, relations and phenomena of being of which the mind takes cognizance. Men still occupied themselves with what was either relatively far off, or deep within them. The things their feet trod on, and their hands handled, and their lungs breathed, and their eyes saw immediately around them were latest in claiming their thoughtful regard. What are now termed the *natural sciences* come last upon the stage, and amongst the latest of all appears Geology, the science of the earth. The metaphysics of Aristotle roused and stimulated the human mind for ages, whilst his physics fell almost still-born. We are told indeed that Solomon “spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes.” This indeed would seem to describe a Linneus or Cuvier come before his time. But even if this knowledge was detailed and classified, which probably it was not, it appears to stand isolated and fruitless in Jewish history. We have no reason to believe that any such development and classification of the natural sciences as the last two hundred years have produced, ever took place before in our world’s history.

And yet when we look at particular cases it is difficult to understand why these sciences should not have taken root in the mind of the race sooner,—unless we attribute it, along with a kindred class of facts, to those great, specific, dominant ideas which rule each their ages. For instance, it is difficult to understand for aught that Hugh Miller received in the way of aid from the scientific achievements of the age, why a similar man might not have arisen a thousand or three thousand years sooner. There were stone-masons then; they worked in quarries amid strata and

water-worn boulders, and the blows of their hammers laid open the well marked fossils, and why should the men like Mr. Miller, who pause to observe, and reflect, and interrogate, and classify the results of their observations, and record their reflections, and answer their own interrogatories, be reserved for the nineteenth century? The question is easily asked and the fact easily stated,—the answer would involve a wider reach of philosophy than we can now pause to attempt.

And it would seem to be widely removed from the anticipations of former ages, that that science which refers particularly to the structure of the earth, which all the generations of men have trodden—the high-soaring minds among them treading it with up-turned gaze as something base and ignoble—and with whose soil they have mingled their dust,—should prove amongst the most sublime, and far-reaching and wonder-inspiring in its inferences, and reasonings, and deductions, of all its kindred sciences. The youngest sister, in these respects, yields nothing even to that eldest sister, who now in her maturity turns her gigantic telescopes toward the starry empyrean. The conceptions of vastness in time, which the geologic ages afford us, are equalled only by the conceptions of vastness in space which are given to our minds by the astronomic parallaxes. And the diversified and wonderful forms of the creative agency sepultured in the long hidden and more than royal mausoleums of our own planet, suggest to our minds the possible diversity and magnificence of the forms of life distributed over that universe whereof astronomy has as yet failed to find the boundaries.

Another note-worthy peculiarity in the progress of science, is that almost every new advance in the path of discovery has been regarded with suspicion and alarm by many among the believers in, and expounders of, revealed religion. Assuming a given interpretation of the Scriptures to be a fixed and known quantity, their particular solution of the great problem of Revelation has been disturbed and thrown into confusion by every new fact of

science which conflicted with that interpretation. And foolishly insisting that every question, astronomical, geographical, or geological, must be settled *biblically*, they have branded with the stigma of infidelity all those who refused to determine the teachings of science by this test. And perhaps many among the sons of science, accepting from the theologians their interpretation as the only true one, have been driven thus into real unbelief of a written revelation. Every new fact of science which infringed upon a traditional understanding of the Scriptures has had to struggle up to its place among recognized facts, amid the strife and violence of heated and embittered controversy, and has gained at last its place among recognized facts only by the inexorable force of those great laws which control human belief. Furthermore, it has so turned out thus far, that these facts of science, after commanding and securing recognition as such, have enlarged our field of view of the Divine character and doings, and left unharmed the evidences of Revealed Religion. They have modified interpretation, they have not vitiated inspiration. The needle will always adjust itself to its true meridian though the dial-plate of the compass may be shifted.

Owing to the "Bible and Science" controversy through which Geology has been called to pass, Hugh Miller, as a Geologist, appears before us in two aspects: first, as a scientific man simply, and second, as a mediator between the contending parties, endeavoring so to adjust the principles of interpretation and the findings of Geology, as that the contestants can come honestly and amicably together—an office for which he was admirably fitted by his thorough scientific, and scarcely less thorough theological acquirements. His best scientific efforts have been put forth to remove the apparent quarrel between Geology and the Scriptures, and to bring about an adjustment between the new science and the old belief. Of his thoroughly earnest and enlightened Christian spirit no reader of his works can doubt, and his readiness honestly and fearlessly to avow any fact, which his science finds to be a fact, regardless of

consequences, no scientific man will be disposed to question. He enjoyed largely the confidence of the best men in both spheres, scientific and theological.

Under the two aspects just referred to, and in the order mentioned, we shall view him in this article.

His scientific education, as we have already intimated, was strictly self-developed. He was led to these pursuits apparently by the force of a strong native instinct. Long before he entered on his calling as a stone-mason, whilst he was playing truant from the village dominie's school, or in the leisure hours of his evenings whilst his school-mates were playing marbles or watching cock-fights, he was rambling about, hammer in hand, filling his pockets with specimens of shells and minerals. On the beach and hill of Cromarty he learned his first lessons. An antique-fashioned hammer "of which the temper was excellent and the haft firmly set," which had belonged to his buccaneering ancestor, old John Feddes, more than a hundred years before, was his constant companion in his daily walks, and many a sturdy blow he dealt with it on the coarse granite, laying open sheets of beautiful black mica, and many were the handsome crystals of garnet he found embedded in mica schist, which he was sure were identical with the "precious stones" set in his mother's gold brooch. Some things he found fired his imagination. In iron pyrites he thought he had found, if not gold, at least the "mother" of it, and in some fine cubes of galena he thought he saw excellent promise of silver, and he lay down at night to dream of Aladdin palaces, and more than baronial riches. In a short time he learned to distinguish by sight, though not of course by name, the porphyries, granites, gniesses, quartz-rocks, clay-slates, and mica-schists, which every where strewed the beach. These he designated by numerals, and their compounds by the respective numerals written as fractions. As he extended his researches he found out a deep ravine in a morass, some half-mile from his native town, in which, after much digging and bemiring himself, he found at the distance of many feet under the soil hazle-

nuts black as jet, and twigs and leaves of oak, beech, and hazle, and at length, on one happy morning, a huge fragment of an extraordinary-looking deer's horn, which uncle James pronounced to belong "to no deer that now lives in this country." Thus he was getting on.

One of his reasons for choosing the trade of a mason was that it would enable him to explore much, and hunt up curious specimens of stones and minerals. And from the first day of his work as an apprentice, his geological observations began, and were carried forward with ever-increasing zest. He saw first ripple marks on the blocks of sandstone deep down in the quarry. He rolled out the water worn boulders from beds of clay hundreds of feet above water mark. "How did that get there?" he asks himself. "Did God make it so? No workman ever makes a half-worn article!" A blow of his hammer on a mass of nodular lime-stone laid open the beautiful ammonite. Within others he found bivalve shells and decayed wood. "How did these get here?" he again asks. Uncle David could not tell him. He took advantage of his first half-holiday to visit a locality some distance from his quarry, in which it was said *thunderbolts* were found in unusual abundance, and which were used by the Highlanders as an unfailing remedy for bewitched cattle. He found several of the thunderbolts, but on examination perceived they bore marks of having been once organic, living creatures, and they finally turned out to be the fossil remains of *belemnites*, a species of cuttle-fish long since extinct. His wandering life as a mason led him over the greater part of Scotland, and wherever he went he took ever increasing care to observe the character and relative position of the various kinds of rock, and compare and classify their respective organic remains. By and by he was able to obtain some assistance from books and the labors of scientific men; and was thereby enabled to make the more rapid progress in comprehending and arranging the facts and materials of his own gathering. After he exchanged the mason life for that, first, of accountant in the bank at Cromarty, and afterwards as editor of the

Edinburg Witness, he still pursued in his leisure hours, with unabated vigor, his favorite studies, and at the time of his death had collected a museum of geological and paleontological specimens, perhaps unsurpassed as the result of the personal labors of one man.

We have thus led the reader, very hastily, through the opening scenes, and over the general course of Hugh Miller's scientific education. We have not attempted to unfold its details as they occurred, preferring, as more suitable to our present purpose, to dwell more particularly upon the *results* of his labors,—to point out the things he really accomplished, the contributions he made, personally, to the science with which his name is associated.

Soon after taking charge, editorially, of the Witness newspaper, he commenced the publication of a series of geological articles, giving the results of his personal observations, which from the lively style in which they were written, and the rich fund of scientific fact they contained, and also from the fact that they were widely copied and commented upon, at once revealed him to the view of the general reading world as an accomplished geologist, and greatly extended his correspondence and acquaintance among scientific men. These articles, amplified and amended, and illustrated with original drawings, have since been published in a volume entitled, "*The Old Red Sandstone.*" The title of the book was derived from the fact that the observations detailed in the articles were confined chiefly to the Old Red Sandstone formation. This book may be regarded as having settled two things: first, that the Old Red Sandstone is a distinct formation, of great thickness and importance, and, second, that it is *richly fossiliferous*. Both these were considered doubtful before the publication of Mr. Miller's articles. The Old Red Sandstone was merged in the Carboniferous System, until its separate character was suggested by Sir Roderick Murchison, and faintly acknowledged by Lyell, and it was regarded by geologists generally as peculiarly barren of fossils. Mr. Miller, by his extensive researches in the Old Red Sand-

stone, fully established its claim to rank as a distinct formation in the geological scale, and his published plates of fossils found by himself, equally surprised and delighted all scientific circles. The first fossil specimen described by him in the "Old Red Sandstone," is that of a winged fish, found about the year 1831, and submitted to Murchison and Agassiz about 1838. Both these distinguished naturalists pronounced it to be of a species before undiscovered, and the latter appropriately named it *Pterichthys Milleri*. During a subsequent visit by Agassiz to Scotland a number of excellent specimens were found, and the *Pterichthys* now has its place in the palæontological chart, and will bear down with it to the scientific men of coming ages the name of the stone-mason of Cromarty. Mr. Miller also found and described, and has given excellent plates of a large number of other fossils, especially fish, which had been found by others in different parts of the world, such as the *Asterolepis*, *Coccosteus*, *Osteolepis*, *Dipterus*, *Diploterus*, *Cheirolepis*, *Glyptolepis*, *Cheiroacanthus*, *Holoptychius*, &c. In some instances by his more accurate knowledge he was able to correct the erroneous opinions and prints of other palæontologists, and his corrections are now accepted as accurate. And in a multitude of instances his observations confirmed the results of the independent labors of others. Had Hugh Miller lived, and enjoyed the vigor of his faculties for twenty years longer, it is probable that his publications would have exhibited the results of a larger measure of personal and original observation and research, than can be claimed for any one man.

The publication of the "Vestiges of Creation," by a countryman of his, turned Mr. Miller's studies for a time into a particular channel. He had found the theory of development and the metamorphosis of species which is so earnestly advocated in that plausible and popular book, first broached in the *Telliamed* of Maillet, a little book which came into his hands whilst a boy, and he subsequently examined it more thoroughly in the works of Lamarck and Oken. It is a theory which at once arrests the atten-

tion of a thinking mind. It startles and astonishes by the boldness and novelty of its conceptions, and it fascinates by the plausibility of the significant facts which it is able to adduce, and its general correspondence with the ascertained order of creation. It has taken powerful hold in whole or in part, of the scientific mind of the age. It is one of those great seed-thoughts which, at intervals of centuries, are dropped into the soil of human knowledge, and which for ages modify the thinking of mankind. The investigations of science, whether amid the nebulae of the heavens, or the rocky strata, and forms of life, past and present, of the earth, all tend now to the unfolding, modifying and correcting of the stupendous *guesses* of La Place and Oken,—and the end is not yet. We may be sure that any such germinant seed-thought is not without its modicum of truth, though the human mind in its first eager joy may play wild gambols with it. Hugh Miller saw and felt the power of this development theory, and he determined to interrogate nature and get if possible a clear answer respecting it; and from what we know of the man, we have no hesitation in saying that had his findings honestly required it, he would have declared for the theory. The results of his investigations he has given in the "Footprints of the Creator," and they are against the theory so far as it includes the transmutation of species, and the development of the higher forms of life from lower. Its eager reception by many of the savans of the age, he attributes to that "species of superstition which inclines men to take on trust whatever assumes the name of science," and which he seems to regard as a reaction on the old superstition that had faith in witches, but none in Sir Isaac Newton, and believed in ghosts, but failed to credit the Gregorian calendar.

It is true that he approached the theory with a bias against it,—a bias resting on strong moral grounds. He regarded it as incompatible with the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul, unless we take with it the immortality of the whole chain of inferior existence, through

which man has arisen,—incompatible also with human responsibility seeing that if there is no future life there will be no future judgment,—and incompatible with the specific doctrines of Christianity as gathering round the fall, and the Incarnation. Taking this serious view of what he supposed to be the inevitable moral bearing of the theory, he justly held that it required an unusual amount of unusually clear scientific proof to warrant its reception. But such proof he did not find, or he would have yielded to it, as he did to the proof against the literal scientific truthfulness of the Mosaic history of the Creation and Deluge.

The development theory of Oken and his disciples may be briefly stated:—"There are two kinds of generation in the world," says Oken, "the creation proper, and the propagation that is sequent thereupon;—or the *generatio originaria*, and *secundaria*. Consequently, no organism has been created of larger size than an infusorial point. No organism is, nor ever has one been created, which is not microscopic. Whatever is larger has not been created, but developed. Man has not been created, but developed." "All life," says Oken further, "is from the sea. Where the sea organism, by self-elevation, succeeds in attaining into form, there issues forth from it a higher organism. The first organic forms, whether plants or animals, emerged from the shallow parts of the sea." Creative power energizing thus only for the production of microscopic organisms, science is able, according to the assertors of this theory, to indicate the path of progressive development until the higher organisms are reached. "It is a vertebral column!" exclaimed Oken one day as he stood contemplating intensely a beautiful blanched skull of a hind picked up on the Hartz mountain. The skulls of all the vertebrata, including man, are actually composed of vertebræ. And high authority in comparative anatomy has confirmed this view—at least that the vertebra is the "ideal exemplar" on which the bones of the head are constructed. The microscopic brain, say the development philosophers, the gelatinous monad probably struck into life by the action of electricity, first

encased itself in a vertebrate skull; from this other vertebræ developed themselves, forming a column, and under certain circumstances throwing out limbs at particular points, and thus through manifold and ever varying transmutations the human skeleton was at length reached. *Nature*, according to this view, has from the beginning been pregnant with the human race, and the long geologic ages are the cycles of its embryonic development. This view they say, receives striking confirmation from the extraordinary fact that the brain of the human foetus passes through the transformations of almost the entire animate scale. First it grows up into a brain closely resembling that of a fish, next it becomes a brain undistinguishable from that of a reptile, further on it assumes the perfect appearance of the brain of a bird, then it develops into a brain like that of a mammiferous quadruped, and finally it assumes its unique character as a human brain. Man thus, say they, retains in the very seat of his intelligence the ineffaceable traces of the path by which he has come, and reveals himself a *microcosm*,—the “sum total of all the animals.”

Such is the bold and startling theory which Hugh Miller set himself to examine and test by the findings of Geology—a theory indeed which the whole scientific world has been examining since the publications of Oken, and in the examination of which a vast amount of most important knowledge has been elicited as to the *order of the creation*, and the *types* or “ideal exemplars” which prevail in it. And it will be seen at once that in examining this hypothesis, Geology is a most important auxiliary. If creation has passed through such a development it is indispensable to have the aid of that science which reads the “Testimony” of by-gone ages on the stony tablets of the earth, in order to trace its path. If there has been no such development, it is indispensable to have the reading of the rocks to ascertain that fact,—as a matter of science.

Mr. Miller rests his verdict against the development hypothesis mainly on four general facts: first, that there is *no trace* any where among fossil remains, or living organ-

isms, of *transmutation of species*. As those who have been engaged in studying the natural history of living animals, have never yet been able to detect, in an actual specimen, one species in the act of passing over into another, so the palaeontologists have never yet been able to detect among the fossils of the earth, any species arrested on the path of its transit or metamorphosis into another species. And when we remember that the fossils already discovered embrace a very great number and variety of the forms of life, both existing and extinct, and stretching back probably to the very beginning of animal life on our planet, and that they embrace also almost every possible state and condition of the several species from the embryo to the mature form, it must be conceded that the negative evidence is very strong. The same is true of vegetable life. And as Oken had declared that "all life is from the sea," Mr. Miller took special pains to examine the two floras, marine and terrestrial, in such localities as, owing to the tides, afforded instances of their overlapping on the same soil, and his unequivocal verdict is that in no case could he detect any evidences of marine vegetation passing over into terrestrial. And not only is there this absence of positive evidence of the transmutation of species, but the distinct type, or pattern, or "ideal exemplar" of each species, among fossils, is most carefully preserved throughout all its varieties and ramifications, descending in the case of fishes even to the microscopic structure of their teeth. This is very strong positive evidence against the hypothesis in question. Mr. Miller justly remarks that the transmutation of species would involve the same sort of problem as the making of two houses alike which differed from each other not only in external form but in internal structure, so that every brick would have to be taken down and every beam and bolt and nail removed.

The second general fact on which Mr. Miller bases his verdict is what he calls the *history of degradation*. By comparing the specimens of the several species which sweep across certain parts of the geological scale, he discovers

that the finest and best individuals of the species appeared first, the inferior afterwards. The act of creation, in each species, was like a ball started at its maximum velocity and which became gradually spent until it ceased altogether. Instead of developing upwards into the higher forms of life, each of the extinct species deteriorated in the exemplifications of its own type, until it finally disappeared. This general position he illustrates by many instances, especially by the *Asterolepis*, a huge Ganoid of the Old Red Sandstone, and which he demonstrates to have been a fish high in the scale of organism and intelligence (piscatory) and yet found at the bottom of the oldest paleozoic system of Scotland. He also discovers that during a geologic epoch, or cycle, not only do the inferior individuals of certain types appear subsequent to the superior ones, but that the inferior types appear in the same order. This he thinks does not indicate an ever upward-tending development, but the stated incomings of the creative fiat.

The third general fact which he adduces is that the fossil remains of past ages do not indicate that the skulls of all the vertebrata are composed of vertabre. In many of the earlier fishes the skull is a simple cartilaginous box, and in others exhibits considerable variety of structure. And though the discovery of Oken may hold good of many of the higher vertebrate animals, no geologist will believe that it has been a universal fact of vertebrate existence.

Mr. Miller's fourth general fact is drawn from a comparison of the bulk and structure of the brain in the various orders of animate existence. He properly holds that the brain is the true criterion by which *highness* or *lowness* in the scale of being ought to be determined. And he shows conclusively that the development of brain in the past history of the earth has not been that of a steady progress; that it exhibits many gaps and sudden starts, and during geologic cycles seems to follow the same law of degradation which appears to govern organization. He also argues that the chasm between the human brain, and that of the form of existence next below, is too great to be bridged by any

hypothesis of development. The average brain of the fish bears a proportion to the spinal cord of not more than two to one. The average brain of the reptile, a proportion of two and a half to one. The average brain of the bird, a proportion of three to one. The average brain of the mammal, a proportion of four to one. Whilst the average human brain bears a proportion to the spinal cord of *twenty three* to one. This is too wide a leap for that law of development which, if it moves at all, moves by almost infinitesimal gradients.

For these general reasons, and other minor ones growing out of them, Hugh Miller, as a man of science, was compelled to decide that the theory of Maillet, Oken, Lamarck, and the "Vestiges of Creation," receives no confirmation, in its most essential features, from Geology.

Whilst thus rejecting the radical idea of the development hypothesis, he by no means ignores the sublime results which science has revealed, whilst investigating that hypothesis, pertaining to the order of creation, and the prevalence of type. He fully recognises the fact that there has been a *general progress* from the lower forms of life to the higher, that the work of the creation has been a stately march, ever pressing onward and upward towards its present terminal stadium, and that the types, or patterns, or ideal exemplars existing in the Divine mind, and most fully exhibited in man the crowning work of all, have been foreshadowed, "manifest in the flesh," in the types of vertebrate existence from the beginning. He recognises the fact that in the order of existence the dynasty of the fish preceded that of the reptile, the dynasty of the reptile preceded that of the mammal, and the dynasty of the mammiferous quadruped preceded that of man, but he asserts that science does not find that the reptile grew out of the fish, the mammal out of the reptile, or man out of the mammal.

Scattered throughout his works which discuss particularly this development theory, there are many high-toned thoughts and deeply suggestive reflections, of a semi-moral, semi-philosophical bearing, as also many highly imagina-

tive and poetical conceptions. And as the theory of development is one which particularly charms and fascinates minds of a highly imaginative cast, it is perhaps well for the cause of truth that one of the ablest opponents of the theory had a large share of imagination in his composition. It is a great mistake to suppose that a strong imaginative faculty is incompatible with the strict severities of inductive science. The imagination of Newton or Galileo took a loftier flight than that of Milton or Dante. We know no more inviting and legitimate field for the best efforts of the imagination than that which is laid open by modern science.

We come now to consider the offices of Mr. Miller in endeavoring to remove the apparent discrepancies between Geology and Genesis.

It was impossible for him to avoid giving his attention largely to this aspect of his favorite science. He would have been untrue to his strong religious convictions, and his deep-seated traditional reverence for the Scriptures—untrue to the blood of Donald Roy—had he failed to do it. It is well known that so soon as the leading discoveries of Geology were made—long before the array of facts and phenomena had reached its present extent—a flagrant discrepancy began to be suspected between its necessary inferences and deductions, and the literal rendering of the first chapter of Genesis. And every additional discovery, every new advance in the science, has only served to strengthen the suspicion and transform it into certainty. The difficulties that have appeared are mainly two, the first pertaining to the *time*, the second to the *order* of the creation. It is held by Geologists that an incalculably longer *time* than is afforded by the Scripture chronology, was required for the production of the phenomena of the earth's crust. It has been objected by theologians that this lengthened chronology does violence to the plain meaning of the inspired record. It is held also by Astronomers and Geologists that the first chapter of Genesis is untrue to fact in its record of the *order* of the creation, making the creation

of the earth to precede that of the sun and stars, and the creation of a multiform and highly organized vegetation to precede the appearance of animal life—that is to say, untrue on the interpretation of those literalists who unfortunately, and with more zeal than knowledge, insist that what they call the “obvious meaning,” is the only meaning. Other difficulties have been felt by certain classes of theologians, as for instance, the existence of death among the animal tribes before the fall of man. And many scientific men have found insuperable difficulties in the way of accepting the universality of the Noachian Deluge. Grave and sore controversy has been the result of the introduction of these novelties of science. It has constituted one feature of the battle of the evidences in these latter ages. Many have been the mediators, interpreters and peace-makers who have risen up to negotiate between the belligerent parties, and bring about an amicable adjustment. Some have offered the supposition of an indefinite interval between the first verse of Genesis and what follows. Others, on philological grounds, have pronounced the length of time indicated by the word “day” to be indefinite. Others have gravely suggested that the fossil remains of the earth were never the forms of living things, but are mere *lusus nature*, created as they are by the power of God; and they have advised Geologists, instead of making such an ado about them, to give them for toys to their children. Others have proposed to regard the narrative in Genesis as an optical description, and as such not to be construed according to the strict requirements of science. The parties to the controversy have been many, each one differing from the other by a shade of opinion; and meantime the science has gone steadily and rapidly forward, strengthening, modifying, or abandoning its former conclusions. But few Geologists have felt themselves called upon to reconcile their discoveries with any pre-existing opinions, or beliefs. They have thrown them out simply as facts, and left them to take care of themselves. Their labors have been purely in the interest of science for its own sake.

As before said Hugh Miller could not avoid entering on this debatable ground; and he entered it as a disputant with his best energies, and with the conscious bearing of a man who was persuaded that the truth was ascertainable, and that when ascertained ought to be fearlessly accepted. His fullest deliverances upon the controverted points are found in his "Testimony of the Rocks,"—his dying legacy—and we may say here summarily that despite the croakings of such ill-starred defenders of the faith as the "Theological and Literary Journal,"* it is a legacy for which the Christian Church ought to embalm his memory. It is the herculean effort of a gigantic mind; and comes nearer securing a full and perfect harmony between science and revelation so as to preserve intact the fundamental idea of inspiration, than any thing which has yet appeared in the English language.

It is worthy of remark that Hugh Miller arrived at the conclusion of the vast antiquity of the globe on the basis of his own independent researches, and had held it for some time before he was aware that a single fellow-being held the same doctrine. Glimpses of the necessity of a greatly

* The article which we have quoted at the head of this paper is one of David N. Lord's most characteristic productions. It abounds in the most absurd protestations of Mr. Miller's ignorance, imbecility, conceit, want of mastery of his subject, superficiality, unfairness and malignity towards his opponents, put forth in a style and manner which exhibit very conspicuously the greater part of these qualities. It abounds also in the grossest misstatements and misconceptions, and generally takes issue on that phase of a point in question which is of least importance. So far as really meeting any of the issues raised by Mr. Miller is concerned, it is unusually feeble. It is little better than raving. It harps perpetually, as its writer always does when treating of geological subjects, upon the "hypothesis of Geologists," that the Geological phenomena "are universally the product of causes the same in kind, *energy and rapidity of action* as those that are now working like effects in the earth's surface," just as if any decent Geologist holds such an hypothesis, or as if it was necessary to the deduction of the great age of the earth. It is certainly amusing to hear a man who probably never struck a blow with a geologist's hammer, call Hugh Miller an ignoramus in Geology. It is quite as amusing as to hear the owl hooting its contempt for the music of the night-ingale. We have never yet been able, after a pretty full perusal of David N. Lord's geological lucubrations, to detect any trustworthy evidences of a practical acquaintance with the science. After reading his account of Mr. Miller's "ill-digested crudities," how refreshing to find Agassiz saying, "His (Hugh Miller's) generalizations have nothing of the vagueness which too often characterizes the writings of those authors who have attempted to make the results of science subservient to the cause of religion."

lengthened chronology often flashed across his mind in the earlier years of his scientific investigations, as he would from time to time lay open some strange fossil far down in its rocky bed, and as he came gradually to observe the regular order of succession in which the strata occurred. But whilst engaged at Cromarty in the lighter occupation of lettering grave stones, after his health had become impaired by his labors as a journeyman mason, he investigated particularly the phenomena of the coast line of the north of Scotland which is finely developed in that neighborhood. He found the present coast line to contain a series of caves evidently hollowed out by the waters, and the average size and extent of which he was able, at low tide, to ascertain. Some twenty feet above these he observed another line of similar caves, into which the sea now does not enter at all, and on exploration he found that these upper caves were on an average, about one third larger and deeper than the lower ones. He found the historical evidence conclusive that the sea has stood against the present coast line at least two thousand six hundred years, and he considered the probability very strong that it has stood there much longer. If then, he argued, it has required *at least* two thousand six hundred years for the sea to hollow out these caves of the present coast line, it must have required *at least* three thousand nine hundred years for it to hollow out the caves of the old coast line. These sums more than exhaust the Hebrew chronology ; but what a mere beginning are they of geologic history ! The organic remains which he procured in the soil below the *old coast line* were nearly all those of *existing* species, whilst in these strata themselves and far below them, were the fossils of the almost countless numbers of the *extinct* species. And how shall the years of these be brought into the historic period ?

We adduce this as a specific instance of the methods in which, and the data from which, Geologists reason with regard to the age of the earth. It is but one instance out of many. The kind of data here given is but one out of

many kinds all having the same general bearing. Hugh Miller loved and revered his Bible, but such is the structure of the human mind, that, save when blinded by passion or warped by prejudice, it must yield an involuntary consent to the force of evidence. The dogmatism which would have forbidden his belief in what thus so clearly demanded it, would have incapacitated him from believing any thing. And he assures us, after his investigations had proceeded much further, that the conviction of the necessity of countless ages for the production of the phenomena of the earth's crust, ever grew deeper and stronger. And we unhesitatingly join him in the prophecy that fifty years hence, no intelligent sane man will dispute it.

In his first examination of the subject he was inclined to hold, with Chalmers and others, the supposition of an indefinite interval between Gen. 1: 1, and the subsequent verses. But this he was obliged, as Geologists generally have been, to abandon, chiefly from the facts that the order in which the deposited strata occur, and the connection between their organic remains show a continuous series of animal and vegetable life from the beginning; and that the organic remains of some of the *existing races* of animals are found far back in the geological scale. The narrative in Genesis, subsequent to the first verse, cannot be taken as a truthful record of the *time* and *order* of the existing creation, if the days are understood as natural days of twenty-four hours each, and the date is assigned from the historic chronology. And after observing that many unhappy efforts have been made, during the progress of theological controversy, to pledge the Scriptures to false science, geographical, astronomical and geological, he justly remarks that the *reading* of what is called the Biblical teaching in matters of science, cannot be the true one if it commits the Scriptures to what he as a geographer, astronomer, or geologist, knows to be a monstrously false geography, astronomy, or geology. He rightly avers that questions in arithmetic must be settled arithmetically, questions in geography, geographically, questions in astronomy, astronom-

ically, and questions in geology, geologically. Neither of them can be settled Biblically apart from an inductive knowledge of the facts; and the author of Scripture, wise above all the ages, has given it to the world in such a *form* that it is pledged, irremediably, to no falsehood whatever.

In the fourth Lecture of the "Testimony of the Rocks," entitled "The Mosaic vision of the Creation," Mr. Miller gives us the *principle* of interpretation which he adopts with regard to the first chapter of Genesis, and which indeed has a manifest application to many parts of Scripture, and which, alone, he thinks, will allow the findings of science to come into harmony with it. It is, that the narrative possesses the character of *optical* description. It is a record of what *appeared* in an inspired *vision*. The writer describes *appearances* as seen from some station above the surface of the earth, and describes each scene by its leading characteristics. Each period of darkness and of light as it rose before the eye is called a *day*, which in the case carries only the cyclical idea. It does not measure, or otherwise limit; and the actual time occupied by the vision may have been but a few hours. Hence the record is not to be tested by its rigid truthfulness to scientific fact, but only its truthfulness as an *order and succession of appearances*. And as such Mr. Miller thinks it is confirmed by Geology.

This principle he derives from Dr. J. H. Kurtz, Professor of Theology at Dorpat, who states it at length in his "Bible and Astronomy." "The source of all history," says he "is *eye-witness*, be it that of the reporter, or of another whose account has been handed down." And as man can see only *the present*, he can record the unknown *past*—i. e., which lies before all *eye-witness*—and the future, only by prophetic vision, unfolding to the eye of the mind what is shut out from the eye of the body. He regards the scenes of the first chapter of Genesis as prophetic tableaux, each containing a leading phase of the drama of creation. "Before the eye of the seer," he says "scene after scene is unfolded, until at length in the seven of them, the course of creation in its main *momenta*, has been fully represented."

The Mosaic narrative then is simply *prophecy* described backwards; and as prophecy can be interpreted accurately only in the light of its fulfilment, Mr. Miller holds that this prophetic vision of the creation can be interpreted accurately only in the light of the findings of science.

Of this work of Dr. Kurtz, which has been translated in this country, we may say briefly that its chief value consists in its elimination of some important general principles—which value is confined to a small part of the book. In its attempt to give a detailed analysis of the “Biblical theory of the World,” and to adjust this theory to the discoveries of natural science, it is wholly worthless. It is a mere tissue of grotesque speculations. Its author appears to be wholly destitute of practical acquaintance with science, and much of its conjectural cosmology belongs to that “cloud-land” in which so many of the speculative Germans make themselves so peculiarly at home. Whether the earth during the geologic ages was the prison-house of the fallen angels, condemned to fellowship with winged dragons, grinning horribly, and huge iguanodons,—whether the angels are corporeal, and the fallen ones irredeemable,—whether the former inhabit the “morning stars,” and the latter now the air,—whether man was originally created without sex, and “observing in the animals the development which was wanting in himself,” conceived the desire of a helpmate of his own kind, to meet which desire God gave him woman and a sexual character,—whether the serpent in the temptation was a real serpent possessed by the devil,—these, we submit, are questions which have nothing to do with the Bible and *Astronomy*. The real value of Dr. Kurtz’s work is greatly marred by the introduction of such extraneous matter, and we read it with that sort of feeling of bewilderment which the mind experiences when the mental images which pass across it seem to be half reality and half phantasmagoria.

The principle of exegesis which Mr. Miller adopts has been far more ably and satisfactorily elaborated by Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL. D., of Union College, in the two works

placed at the head of this article. In patient and laborious scholarship, in profound and comprehensive thought, in honest and intense earnestness, in intelligent and vigorous grasp of any subject germane to his mind, Prof. Lewis has few equals and perhaps no superior in this country. He has grappled with the question of Biblical interpretation with the consciousness of the life-and-death nature of the controversy, and he puts the issue on a far higher and broader platform than that of literalists generally; and we instinctively feel as we follow him through its elaboration that the solution, on its biblical side, must come from the general region which he has mapped out. On the title page of his first work we have the announcement of the seminal ideas which control his exegeses, and which he thinks will put the scriptural cosmogony beyond all successful attack from the side of science; and in a supplementary work, "The Bible and Science; or the World Problem," the same ideas are more fully expanded and vindicated against polemic misrepresentation and attack. He is a literalist; but his literalism is that, not of the English version with modern ideas attached, but of the old generic Shemitic words, with the old Shemitic space-and-time conceptions which he apprehends them to have conveyed. We hesitate not to say that Prof. Lewis has originated a new order of speech amongst the learned on these subjects,—has sprung a new mine of thought,—new at least in this country,—and has vindicated for himself a position among the original, creative thinkers of the time. No philologist, henceforth, can venture safely to ignore the results of his philological labors, in this particular sphere. He is not, indeed, as he says, "a man of science,"—and this is his chief defect,—but only "having some general information upon such subjects." He does, moreover, bear himself at times somewhat haughtily towards the claims of science. His maxims are that the Bible must be *interpreted*, not reconciled with any thing,—that it must be interpreted *from itself*, not forced into a meaning by the outside pressure of

science,—that science and the Bible have nothing in common,—that, the fair meaning of the text once ascertained, if science agrees with it, so much the better for science, if science does not agree with it so much the worse for science. He has no idea of “Biblical men ever putting ahead their hermeneutical landmarks every time science chooses to change her oft-shifting positions.” Accordingly he goes to work to ascertain precisely what the Scriptures do, and do not, teach, on cosmological matters, uninfluenced, *as he supposes*, by the necessity which science has forced upon the thinking of the age.

This supercilious bearing is unfortunate, and unnecessary. Some of his general positions, also, which have a scientific bearing, are faulty; and in other parts of his works there is perhaps an excess of idealism, high-toned though it be, and eloquently put. But, withal, Tayler Lewis has done vast service for all parties interested in these subjects. His philological or verbal exegesis is infinitely more worthy of respect than the more narrow literalism, and it opens up a much wider field of possibility for the ultimate harmony of the Bible and science. We think he has shown beyond all successful contradiction that the primitive ideas represented by the time-words used in the Mosaic cosmology, were ideas of vast, undefined duration, or great cyclical periods,—that the dynamic words used are not those which convey the idea of creation out of nothing,—a doctrine which he boldly asserts is neither affirmed nor denied in the Scriptures,—but the ideas of formation and building out of previously existing chaos, and the ideas of generation, birth, growth of successive creations through successive time-worlds, or ages,—and that the language in general is not scientific but phenomenal, describing appearances as they might truly be conceived alike by the earliest and the latest human thinking. We think he has shown that, whether true or false, the thoughtful Shemitic mind had these ideas, and that they have naturally and inevitably embedded themselves in the Scriptural cosmology.

And for his profound elaboration of the doctrine that *nature* is not only a growth, but a power,—that it is a real, divinely originated order of existence, having its implanted laws and forces, and made to “go of itself,”—for his equally profound exposition and vindication of the Platonic doctrine of ideas and types,—for his liberal speculations upon the probable extent of the universe in space and time,—and for his earnest pleading for the existence of a higher order of truth than that which lies within the domain of the so-called natural sciences, we consider the age laid under an incalculable amount of obligation to him as a contributor to the material of its present and future thought. We can only commiserate the shallow empiricists who sneer at his “Platonic dreaming.”

The Professor's chief, and in his own view, most valuable position is identical with Hugh Miller's, viz: that “*the Mosaic creation was an order and succession of appearances.*” This is kept steadily in view throughout his whole discussion; but not being “a man of science,” he is greatly at a loss to give us any accurate and well defined ideas of this order and succession, and hence he is often unsatisfactory in his details, or the application of his general principles, and guilty of gross omissions in his statements of scientific difficulties. He is often obliged to expend an amount of ingenuity in reconciling this order and succession of *appearances* with facts, or with the recognized theory of the structure of the universe, which impairs the reader's confidence, and which thorough scientific knowledge would have rendered unnecessary. These defects in Prof. Lewis' works are admirably supplied by the great scientific attainments of Hugh Miller, in his “*Mosaic Vision of the Creation.*” He gives us a magnificent panoramic view of this “order and succession of *appearances*,” basing his conception of it upon the revealed facts of geology, and the laws of nature. Being able by the aid of the revelations of geology, to conceive of the state of the earth and atmosphere during any great geological era, he is able to project, as it were, upon the canvass of the imagination the *appearance* it would pre-

sent, in such era, to the mind of the seer before whom it was supernaturally brought. In bold grasp of imagination, in felicitous description, and in eloquent richness of diction we have not found the fourth Lecture of the "Testimony of the Rocks" surpassed in our recent reading.

Keeping in view his adopted principle of interpretation, Mr. Miller, as a *geologist*, feels called upon to account for the appearances of but three out of the six great creative days: and hence, whilst he suggests to us enough to enable us to conceive how the inspired record of the first, second and fourth days may be a record of actual appearances, he undertakes only to detail the geological evidences of the general truthfulness of the record of the third, fifth and sixth days' work,—the period of plants, the period of great sea monsters and creeping things, and the period of cattle and beasts of the earth. All geologists, he tells us, agree in holding that the vast geological scale naturally divides into *three* great parts. There are many lesser divisions,—divisions into systems, formations, deposits, beds, strata; but the master divisions, in each of which we find a type of life so unlike that of the others, that even the unpracticed eye can detect the difference, are simply three,—the Palæozoic, or oldest fossiliferous division, the Secondary, or middle fossiliferous division; and the Tertiary, or latest fossiliferous division. He then goes on to point out in a graphic and highly picturesque sketch the prominent features of these three great divisions. The leading characteristic of the first, which he considers to be indicated by the third of the Mosaic days, was its rank and gorgeous vegetation. It had its forms of animal life, corals, molluscs, fishes, and in its later formations a few reptiles. But its prominent feature, that which would strike most obviously the eye of an observer, was its gorgeous flora. "In no other age did the world ever witness such a flora; the youth of the earth was peculiarly a green and umbrageous youth,—a youth of dusk and tangled forests, of huge pines and stately araucarians, of the reed-like calamite, the tall tree-fern, the sculptured sigillaria, and the hirsute lepi-

dodendron. Wherever any land, or shallow lake, or running stream appeared, from where Melville island now spreads out its ice wastes under the star of the pole, to where the arid plains of Australia lie solitary beneath the bright cross of the south, a rank and luxuriant herbage cumbered every footbreadth of the dank and steaming soil." Of this extraordinary age of plants we have our exhaustless remembrancers in the vast coal fields of the earth.

In like manner Mr. Miller shows that the prominent feature of the second great division, represented by the fifth of the Mosaic days, was found in its reptilian forms of life,—its huge creeping things, its enormous monsters of the deep, its gigantic birds, its reptilian whales, its lizards and crocodiles. It had its herbs and plants also, of course, and its corals, molluscs and fish, but the feature which distinguished it from the former period, was that just indicated,—even as the distinguishing feature of the fourth Mosaic day—the most marked *appearance*—was the partial breaking and dissipation of the thick garment of cloud previously sent up by the warm and steaming earth, and the appearance of the luminaries in the heavens. The leading feature of the third great division of the geologist,—the sixth Mosaic day—consisted in its extraordinary mammalian existences,—its immense beasts of the earth,—its mammoths, its mastodons, its rhinoceri, its hippopotami, its elephants, its enormous dinotherium, its colossal megatherium, its great oxen and elks, its hyenas, tigers and bears. These have left their huge remains in the rocks, and they tell of the work of the sixth day, at the close of which man comes upon the stage, to work out his history on the seventh, during which God rests, save in the work of his redemption.

Such is Mr. Miller's method of collating the two records. And it will be seen at once that it affords a wide margin for the removal of some of the most stubborn difficulties of the literalist. Take a single instance. If geology teaches us any thing, if it gives us any one fact as indisputable as the Copernican astronomy, it is that animal life was as early,

at least, if not earlier, on this planet, than vegetable life. And this fact raises an obstacle in the way of the literalist which he cannot surmount. But regarding the Mosaic record, not as that of an order and succession of facts strictly construed, but an "order and succession of appearances," and each vast period, as that represented by the third day, described by its *prominent* feature, the difficulty is at least very much lessened.*

We cannot refrain from giving a condensed view of Mr. Miller's enlarged speculations—thought-graspings we might call them—upon the general drift and terminal results of the magnificent progress of creation which Geology reveals. Each of the great forms of animal life, the fish, the reptile, the beast of the earth, has had its dynasty upon the earth, and its dominion has passed away never to return. The present historical period is the dynasty of man. But is that all? No! His dynasty is passing away. It cannot last forever. And what is to be the next advance? Shall there be a new creation, and man be again placed upon the earth to enact a new probation and a new history? No! God's works never thus merely repeat themselves. No departed dynasty ever returns. The clue he thinks is found in the *new creation in Christ Jesus*—a crea-

* It is perhaps too much to say that for all minds the difficulty is *wholly* removed; for it is not the fact that the Palæozoic division can be represented truly as characterized *throughout its entire extent*, by a luxuriant flora, nor does it seem to have been Mr. Miller's intention so to represent it, though in the use of his general terms he is perhaps not careful enough to avoid leaving this impression upon the mind of the general reader. To this point Wm. Parker Foulke, Esq., of Philadelphia, called the attention of the Academy of Natural Sciences, in May, 1854, and again more fully in May of the present year, and has embodied his remarks and explanations in the pamphlet which we have named in our prefacing list. Mr. Foulke justly remarks, that it is proper to maintain a strict scrutiny of the logic of the natural sciences, and to allow no generalization to be used improperly "for a purpose." It is true, as Mr. Foulke states, and Mr. Miller admits, that it is only of the "carboniferous era" of the Palæozoic division, that an exuberant vegetation can be predicated, and that this era falls far forward in the series; and the harmony of Mr. Miller's position with the Mosaic record can only be maintained by supposing that the "carboniferous era" was the period chosen for bringing the "vision" of the third "day" before the mind of the prophet. We happen to be acquainted with Mr. Foulke, and know him to be a high-minded, honorable and accomplished man, and regret the asperity with which Mr. Miller repels his criticisms.

tion already begun, but reaching forward into immortality—a divine seed already implanted in the bosom of humanity to ripen in a future eternity. The dynasty of the Future is to have glorified man for its inhabitant—man glorified by his union with Deity—man “created anew in Christ Jesus.” And the kingdom, the monarchy of this future, is to be that of God in the form of man. In the doctrine of the two natures of Christ we find the point towards which all creation has been tending, and beyond which it cannot go. The long ascending line from dead matter to man—a line conducted not by “development” alone, but by the incomings of the creative fiat,—has been a progress God-wards, and in the Incarnation it finds its terminal point. And in *Him*, true God and true man,—*Him* who is our risen and adorable Redeemer,—*Him* who wears our nature in glory upon the throne of the universe,—*Him* who shall put all things under his feet,—in *Him* let the world recognize the adorable Monarch of all the Future!

Besides thus attempting to harmonize the Mosaic record and the findings of Geology, Mr. Miller expends two lectures on the Bearing of Geology on the two theologies, natural and revealed, in which are some very original and valuable suggestions. Especially admirable and ingenious are the uses which he makes of the evidences of Geology against the old atheistic idea of an “infinite series” of beings,—against the argument of Hume from the “singularity” of creation, as a result standing alone and affording no ground for inference with regard to the character of its Creator beyond what it alone, as an effect, reveals,—against the infidelity of Bolingbroke grounding itself on the position which man holds in the scale of creation,—and also against the Lamarckian hypothesis to which we have already referred in his “Footprints of the Creator.” Another ingenious line of argument which he pursues is that in which he traces what he calls an identity between the Divine and human methods and devices, showing that some of the most remarkable triumphs of human skill and ingenuity had been anticipated by the Divine Architect,—or rather that

in both we see the outworking of the same Divine wisdom. Thus the ribs and grooves lately introduced into metallic roofs and boats for purposes of strength, he finds anticipated for like purposes in the shells of the old ammonites: some of the most graceful ornaments of the Ionic and Corinthian orders of architecture in the whorled shells of the Old Red Sandstone; and some of the most popular calico patterns in the corals of the same formation. Probably his brief hints, here, may open a field of interesting discovery which may be turned to some practical account.

The two lectures in the "Testimony of the Rocks," which are in some respects the most remarkable, and the most likely to conflict seriously with the common traditional opinions of this country, are those upon the Noachian Deluge. He finds himself forced to accept the hypothesis of a partial or local deluge. He finds the physical difficulties in the way of a universal deluge, in the circumstances in which it is narrated in Genesis, utterly overwhelming. His statement of these is incomparably the strongest we have any where seen. He shows that to make the ark, taking its largest known measurement, contain species of all the existing animals and birds, with food for a twelvemonth, would require an amount of miracle equal to that of contracting their size, so that an elephant might be no larger than a rat.* He shows that to get the various species of animals to and from the ark, bringing them from and returning them to their several centres of distribution, would require an amount of miracle equal to that of transporting them through the air. He shows that a twelvemonth's inundation would destroy all the fresh water fishes and a great part of the flora of the earth. And, further, he thinks the evidence conclusive that neither Europe, nor the British isles, nor the continents of North and South America, have been submerged beneath the waves within any such period as that which has elapsed since the times

* We commend to David N. Lord this form of miracle as solving the difficulty. It would compare favorably with a number of others accepted in "Geognosy."

of Noah. His own theory of the Deluge he gives, of course, as mere conjecture; and we are not prepared to say that it is satisfactory. The subject is one for future settlement. He thinks that the population of the antediluvian world, owing to its violence and bloodshed, was not as numerous as is generally supposed—that they were all living on that *sunken* portion of the continents of Asia and Europe, now drained by the Volga, the Oural, the Sihon, the Kour and the Ainoo, and that there they were submerged and destroyed; and that the narrative is given according to the *appearance* of the catastrophe to those who witnessed it. The subject deserves, and will doubtless receive further consideration.

After an admirable lecture on "the Discoverable and the Revealed," Mr. Miller closes the semi-controversial portion of his volume with a scathing *expose* of the Anti-Geologists. It is done in a manner in which he only could do it. Instead of revealing, according to the *Theological and Literary Journal*, "a morbid sensitiveness and irritability," and "a splenetic and vituperative temper," it is calm, deliberate and unimpassioned, and its only virulence consists in exhibiting the class of writers to whom it refers, "as they have exhibited themselves." We think no sensible man after reading it, will expect ever to see the strong positions of science shaken by the absurd subterfuges of non-scientific men, who think that thereby they are doing God service. We had only two regrets in our perusal of it, first, that most of the Anti-Geologists whom he is obliged to put in the pillory, are clergymen, who have a zeal for Scripture, but "not according to knowledge," and second, that Mr. Miller had not read "Geognosy," and sundry articles in the *Theological and Literary Journal*.

The two opening lectures of the book on the Palæontological history of Plants and Animals, and the two concluding ones on the less known Fossil Floras of Scotland, are rich in interesting scientific matter, and show that the lamented author up till a short time previous to his death, was pursuing his favorite investigations with unabated vigor.

We have thus completed our *résumé* of the scientific labors and studies of Hugh Miller. In doing so we have been led through a field as rich in material as it is exhaustless in interest. We shall have done much if we succeed in inducing a goodly number of our readers to enter that field themselves, and to acquaint themselves more fully with the works of one of the most extraordinary men, and remarkable writers of the present age.

We venture, in conclusion, a few remarks on the present posture, and the present demands of this new phase of the "battle of the Evidences." The "Bible and Science" controversy of the age cannot be ignored. It may be the herald of a new phase of faith, or want of faith, as potent as any which have gone before it. And let not the Church despise the offices of such honest and able mediators as Hugh Miller, whilst at the same time she endeavors to pursue the cautious and safe *viam mediam*. It is a dictate of common sense that received, or so-called established truth, ought not to be rashly impugned, or for slight reasons discarded. Changes of opinion, especially of religious opinion, to be healthful, ought to be slow. Accepted truth, or truth held to be established, has always an acquired claim to respect, and that claim can only be made legitimately to yield to the fullest and clearest demands of evidence. But let not such evidence be foolishly outlawed. Let not the Church "kick against the pricks." Let her accept all the aids of a cautious, Christian science. It is wholly gratuitous to assume that such men as Hugh Miller wish to prove the Bible untrue. Their so-called "infidel" tendencies are not of their own choosing. Their stubborn facts are not made, but found; and nothing can be more suicidal in our theological disputants than to attempt to overwhelm with the *odium theologicum* men whose hearts honestly revolt against, and whose whole lives are standing refutations of, the base motives imputed to them. Let the age seize these questions with tenfold ability and zeal. Let the ablest and most earnest men lay hold of them in their most urgent aspects. Let there be discussion, frank,

open, fearless, charitable. Let none be afraid of the truth, whatever it may be. Let not timid religionists or haughty bigots suppose that by an outcry over the horrors of infidelity, or the blasphemies of German rationalism, they can drive back a spirit of inquiry which is strong in learning, conscious of moral integrity, crested with genius, strenuous, yet calm in progress.

Chambersburg, Pa.

J. C.

ART. V.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

SLAVERY AND THE REMEDY: OR THE PRINCIPLES AND SUGGESTIONS FOR A REMEDIAL CODE. By Samuel Nott. Fifth Edition; with a review of the Supreme Court in the Case of Dred Scott. New York: D. Appleton and Company. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 137 pp. 1857.

The general position and design of this work may be gathered from the following extract from the Introduction: "We meet Slavery as a fact, not as a proposal. We have to do with slave-holding, not with slave-making. We seek not what should be done if there were no slaves, but what is right and best now that there are three millions.

"Admitting the evil of slavery, and the imperious demand for a Remedial Code, but denying slave-holding as a sin *per se*, and immediate abolition as the remedy;—asserting that the African race is fixed, and must be provided for chiefly on our soil, and yet approving heartily colonization in Africa;—claiming that the climate and productions of the South, and the original and actual condition of the enslaved race, forbid the methods of the North and the Anglo-Saxon race;—turning the question from mere abolition and mere slavery, to the *well-being* of a people providentially on our hands;—and, lastly, fixing the responsibility upon each slaveholding State separately, and denying it to the United States;—*a remedy is sought suited to the peculiar case*—a REMEDIAL CODE, at least an experiment of relief and benefit, which wisely and successfully made by any single State, might lead the whole sisterhood in her train."

He then lays down a fundamental proposition which becomes the ruling idea of the whole discussion, namely: "A Christian State, philanthropic, patriarchal, is bound to abolish just so much of Slavery as is injurious, and no more; to retain just so much as is beneficial, and no less. The Christian patriarch and Christian philanthropist need not be at variance, if they will but unite in the simple attempt to promote the well-being of the slaves in and with the well-being of the whole people."

The proposed Remedial Code, the author continues, must aim at the following purposes: 1. To provide for the slaves as a mass, something better than freedom; 2. To provide for the masters something better than "Slavery as it is;" 3. To provide for the free blacks, and for those becoming free, something better than the present condition of their class; 4. To satisfy the conscience and philanthropy of the country, not merely by the "happy medium" between evil extremes, but to give full scope to the truest benevolence, the most faithful duty, the most earnest Christian charity; in which the South, taking the indispensable lead, shall welcome with the whole heart the aid of the North.

To solve these momentous problems is a grave and difficult undertaking, a fact of which Dr. Nott seems to be deeply sensible. But he addresses himself to the task in a calm and earnest spirit, and conducts the discussion with much dignity and ability. We do not, however, propose to follow him by way of review or criticism, our aim being simply to exhibit, in a few words, the plan and general principles of the work. The conclusion at which the author arrives is, that if, whilst the relation of master and slave still remains, namely, whilst the master is still "held" to provide rations and privileges and the slave is still "held to labor," marriage be established in its sacredness, and the domestic relations protected; if education and religious worship be provided for; if the slaves be legally capable of acquiring, holding and transmitting property, and equally with their masters under the protection of the law; and if all these exist with opportunities of freedom, and methods for the free, we shall then have a *Remedial Code* in progress and perfecting by experience, suited to the whole case of Africa in America.

E. V. G.

GUIDE TO THE ORACLES; OR THE BIBLE STUDENT'S VADE-MECUM.

By Alfred Nevin, D. D., author of "Spiritual Progression," "Churches of the Valley," etc. Lancaster, Pa.: Murray, Young & Co. 1857.

The author states in the Preface, that this book is "not intended for learned theologians, or for students of Biblical science

who have access to large libraries, but for the Sabbath-school and Bible-class Teachers and Scholars, and others who feel the need, as it is believed many do, of a convenient and compendious volume, to which they can at any time turn for information to aid them in understanding and defending the Word of God. It has been prepared to serve in this direction as a manual, to which recourse can be had with confidence and comfort, for explanations which might be found elsewhere, but only after research involving a greater expenditure of time and means."

The design of the author is a very good one. To the student of the Sacred Scriptures numerous questions present themselves continually which must be answered in order to render his studies profitable. And although there are books treating on all these important subjects, both scientific and popular, there is room, nevertheless, for a work constructed like the one before us. In addition to a number of short dissertations on the Preservation, the Unity, the Freshness, the Literature of the Bible, etc., it collects from different authors a great deal of information, the result generally of careful study and critical research, within a small compass and in a convenient form for daily use. The design has in the main been well executed; and we doubt not the book will prove to be a valuable help to youth and to Christians in general, and even to ministers who may not have access to other and larger works.

It is not free, however, from what we must regard as inaccuracies. The list of "Names and Titles given to Christ," inserts, for example, the phrase, *fatted calf*, (Luke 15 : 23) as a name of Christ; and omits *Word*, a title of peculiar and profound significance given to our Lord in John 1 : 1, et seq. We can not appreciate the force of the exegesis that does either. The list has *God* as a name of Christ, and refers to the passage just quoted from St. John's Gospel. The term *God* is indeed a name applied to our Lord in the New Testament, but it is not applied to Him in this passage. The title *Word* is applied to Him here; and the Evangelist affirms the *Word* to be *God*. The name *God* being used to designate the Supreme Being, he predicates Divine Essence properly of Him whom he calls the *Word*.

Notwithstanding these, and other inaccuracies, to which space does not allow us to refer, the work possesses positive merits, which commend it to our regard. It is an important manual for convenient reference, containing trustworthy information on a great variety of Scriptural subjects.

E. V. G.

THE DIVINE LIBRARY; OR, CYCLOPEDIA OF INSPIRATION. The Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ according to St. Matthew. Received Version in paragraph Form.

Rev. Mr. Stockton has undertaken the publication of what he calls the Periodical New Testament, that is of the several books of the New Testament in separate successive volumes, appearing every ten days or two weeks, so as to complete the whole by the coming in of the New Year. The First Number contains the Gospel by St. Matthew, to which is annexed a table of the chapters with their contents; the Introduction of Bishop Horne to Matthew as revised, corrected and improved by Dr. Tregelles; and several very beautiful plates. The type is clear; the paper fine; and the whole book very neat. We welcome the volume cordially, and commend it to general favor.

We think, however, that if Mr. Stockton had adopted the duodecimo form, this publication would have been more beautiful and more acceptable, both in its parts and as a whole.

Price 50 cts., Post-Free.

E. V. G.

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA: Being a Condensed Translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia: with additions from other Sources. By Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., assisted by distinguished Theologians of various denominations. Part V. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857. pp. 513—640.

We are very much gratified at the regular issue of the successive numbers of Dr. Bomberger's translation of Herzog's Encyclopedia—the most extensive, thoroughly scientific and trustworthy theological publication of the kind that has proceeded from the American press. Part Fifth runs from *Caiaphas* to *Charles V*; and contains many learned and very valuable articles, to which reference can be made as authority with entire confidence; such as *Calvin*, *Canaan*, *Canon of the Old Testament*, *Canon of the New Testament*, *Carlstadt*, *Catechization*, *Catholicism*, *Chalmers*, &c., &c. By far the greater proportion of the papers are by the Editor; the rest are from the pen of Rev. Reinecke, Dr. J. W. Nevin, Rev. Ermentrout, Prof. Ruetenik, Dr. Yeomans, Prof. Porter, Rev. E. D. Yeomans, Dr. Wolff and Rev. Beck. The perspicuous, forcible and elegant English diction which characterizes the Encyclopedia, evinces the good taste and ability of this company of judicious translators.

We take great pleasure in renewing our recommendation of the work.

E. V. G.

THE STUDENT'S MANUAL OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

This volume is prepared for the New Testament; with a page for every chapter, and an index of subjects. For the use of Preachers, Teachers, Parents, and Private Readers. T. H. Stockton, 68 Lexington St., Baltimore, Md. 1856.

As the title implies, this is a blank book appropriating a page to every chapter of the New Testament, and is designed for the convenient record of any thought, fact, suggestion, etc., that may occur to the mind in connection with any book, chapter or verse. A good expedient, we think; it will serve to meet a want which every student of the Bible has felt; and we recommend it, for trial at least, to Ministers and Teachers. It is worthy of consideration, however, whether it would not be an improvement of the plan to print the text itself, judiciously distributed, along the top of the page.

E. V. G.

THE LIFE OF CHARLOTTE BRONTE, Author of "Jane Eyre," "Shirley," "Villette," etc. By E. C. Gaskell, Author of "Mary Barton," etc. In two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1857.

The instances of real power evinced by the female mind in the walks of literature have been very few. We have had in the present generation a perfect avalanche of female authors, and the ladies have abundantly vindicated their ability to write, but they have not so fully established their ability to think. Now and then, however, a *rara avis* spreads her plumage for the literary flight, and proves by the strength of her wing, that she can hold her place high in the intellectual empyrean. Such were Madame de Stael, Mrs. Hemans, Margaret Fuller, Charlotte Bronte and a few others.

It seems to be conceded by common consent, that Charlotte Bronte was one of the most remarkable of our modern literary women. Even before the authorship of her anonymous works was known it was generally acknowledged that they indicated no ordinary power.

The Life before us is one of sad and painful interest, and exhibiting much self-sacrificing heroism. Charlotte Bronte's experiences were no common ones, and they are graphically detailed by the faithful hand of a friend. We commend the book as one well worthy of perusal.

C.

